

EXHIBIT C

Scott Shaw

From: Stephen M. Doniger [stephen@donigerlawfirm.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2011 1:50 PM
To: Scott Shaw; 'Regina Yeh'
Cc: Aaron Renfro
Subject: RE: Activity in Case 2:10-cv-02102-GW -JEM L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. CSI Industries, Inc. et al Notice of Settlement

Scott,

USTP negotiated a settlement directly with LA Printex. That settlement includes a release of all fabric it printed with the offending design, and specifically includes the garments that were sold through Wet Seal. The case is done. Either we get a stipulation to dismiss with prejudice on file or we will make a motion for the same. Towards that end, and if your client for some reason refuses to stipulate to a dismissal, please consider this to be our request pursuant to Local Rule 7-3 to confer over a motion to dismiss all claims in the case regarding design N0042 on the grounds that a good faith settlement and resolution of those claims has been reached for which your client is a third party beneficiary. I request we hold this conference Friday morning at 10am, but please advise if there is a more convenient time.

Thanks.

Stephen M. Doniger, Esq.
DONIGER / BURROUGHS, APC
300 Corporate Pointe, Suite 355
Culver City, CA 90230
Telephone: 310-590-1820
Facsimile: 310-417-3538
www.donigerlawfirm.com

From: Scott Shaw [mailto:sshaw@calljensen.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2011 1:05 PM
To: Regina Yeh
Cc: Stephen M. Doniger; Aaron Renfro
Subject: RE: Activity in Case 2:10-cv-02102-GW -JEM L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. CSI Industries, Inc. et al Notice of Settlement

Regina,

Yes, please file a notice of errata as to Wet Seal. I am confused why Frank or anyone would have been speaking on behalf of Wet Seal.

In the meantime, I will try to get in touch with Frank to find out the status, and perhaps there will be a settlement. I just don't know, because I was never involved in the process and I need to be, because I am the counsel of record for Wet Seal. Frank's client never agreed to defend and indemnify Wet Seal, but maybe they are agreeing to do so now. If you hear from Frank, please tell him to contact me ASAP.

Scott P. Shaw
Shareholder
Call & Jensen
610 Newport Center Drive, Suite 700
Newport Beach, California 92660
Telephone: (949) 717-3000
Facsimile: (949) 717-3100
sshaw@calljensen.com

EXHIBIT C

6/17/2011

www.calljensen.com

The preceding email message (including any attachments) contains information that may be confidential, protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or constitutes non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Use, dissemination, or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

From: Regina Yeh [mailto:regina@donigerlawfirm.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2011 12:50 PM
To: Scott Shaw
Cc: 'Stephen M. Doniger'; Aaron Renfro
Subject: RE: Activity in Case 2:10-cv-02102-GW -JEM L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. CSI Industries, Inc. et al Notice of Settlement

I left you a voice message earlier today, but it is my understanding that LA Printex and USTP have resolved their claims against each other, and therefore the claims with Wet Seal were also resolved.

If that is not the case, then I will file a notice of errata to reflect that the action may still be active as to Wet Seal. Can you also confirm if that is the case? Thanks,

Regina Yeh

From: Scott Shaw [mailto:sshaw@calljensen.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2011 12:35 PM
To: Regina Yeh
Cc: Stephen M. Doniger; Aaron Renfro
Subject: FW: Activity in Case 2:10-cv-02102-GW -JEM L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. CSI Industries, Inc. et al Notice of Settlement

Regina,

What is this? Wet Seal has not agreed to sign off on any settlement, as far as I know. You did not have permission to file this on behalf of Wet Seal, who has expended a significant amount of money defending this case.

Please e-mail the status ASAP.

Thank you.

Scott P. Shaw
Shareholder
Call & Jensen
610 Newport Center Drive, Suite 700
Newport Beach, California 92660
Telephone: (949) 717-3000
Facsimile: (949) 717-3100
sshaw@calljensen.com
www.calljensen.com

The preceding email message (including any attachments) contains information that may be confidential, protected by the attorney-client or other applicable privileges, or constitutes non-public information. It is intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient of this message, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from

6/17/2011

your system. Use, dissemination, or reproduction of this message by unintended recipients is not authorized and may be unlawful.

From: cacd_ecfmail@cacd.uscourts.gov [mailto:caed_ecfmail@cacd.uscourts.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2011 12:31 PM
To: ecfnef@cacd.uscourts.gov
Subject: Activity in Case 2:10-cv-02102-GW -JEM L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. CSI Industries, Inc. et al Notice of Settlement

This is an automatic e-mail message generated by the CM/ECF system. Please **DO NOT RESPOND** to this e-mail because the mail box is unattended.

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS***** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing. However, if the referenced document is a transcript, the free copy and 30 page limit do not apply.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Notice of Electronic Filing

The following transaction was entered by Doniger, Stephen on 5/11/2011 at 12:30 PM PDT and filed on 5/11/2011

Case Name: L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. CSI Industries, Inc. et al
Case Number: 2:10-cv-02102-GW -JEM
Filer: L.A. Printex Industries, Inc.
Document Number: 174

Docket Text:

NOTICE of Settlement *OF CLAIMS WITH RESPECT TO PLAINTIFF L.A. PRINTEX INDUSTRIES, INC.S N0042 DESIGN* filed by Plaintiff L.A. Printex Industries, Inc.. (Doniger, Stephen)

2:10-cv-02102-GW -JEM Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Aaron Lewis Renfro arenfro@calljensen.com, sbravo@calljensen.com

Aidan W Butler tocontactaidan@gmail.com

Brian C Vanderhoof bvanderhoof@ropers.com, aarriola@ropers.com, kkakiuchi@ropers.com, lrich@rmkb.com

Christopher S Walters cwalters@hansonbridgett.com, calendarclerk@hansonbridgett.com, lprongos@hansonbridgett.com

6/17/2011

Emily Lacey Rice lrice@rmkb.com

Frank N Lee franknlee@gmail.com

Garner K Weng gweng@hansonbridgett.com, calendarclerk@hansonbridgett.com,
lprongos@hansonbridgett.com

James C Potepan jpotepan@ropers.com, aarriola@ropers.com, kkakiuchi@rmkb.com,
tpierson@rmkb.com

Martin J Kaufman mjk@lklaw.net

Scott A Burroughs scott@donigerlawfirm.com

Scott P Shaw sshaw@calljensen.com, kdominick@calljensen.com

Stephen M Doniger stephen@donigerlawfirm.com, agrozman@donigerlawfirm.com,
regina@donigerlawfirm.com

Thomas M O'Leary toleary@rmkb.com, aarriola@rmkb.com, kkakiuchi@rmkb.com,
lrich@rmkb.com

William G Barrett wgb@lklaw.net

2:10-cv-02102-GW -JEM Notice has been delivered by First Class U. S. Mail or by fax to :

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document description:Main Document

Original filename:C:\fakepath\Notice of Settlement_N0042.pdf

Electronic document Stamp:

[STAMP cacdStamp_ID=1020290914 [Date=5/11/2011] [FileNumber=11599169-0
] [3786879e874d820ab5c005336af4f0870e3afae54df80dbed573cf520d629933db5
3fe6614aa95c3ecfdff3dad64856f87b2db433a471d017d70d3823d1aefe9]]

EXHIBIT D

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
05/31/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 46789

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

05/18/2010	SPS	REVIEW AND ANALYZE NEW COMPLAINT AGAINST WET SEAL.	0.30	115.50
05/19/2010	BPA	REVIEW AND ANALYZE COMPLAINT AND PREPARE ANSWER.	2.30	667.00
	ANC	PREPARE NEW MATTER PROFILE; REVIEW AND ANALYZE COMPLAINT AND CIVIL CASE DOCUMENTS; REVIEW PACER DOCKET HISTORY; CALENDARING REGARDING SERVICE AND RESPONSIVE PLEADING.	0.90	171.00
	SPS	REVIEW AND REVISE DRAFT ANSWER TO COMPLAINT.	0.70	269.50
05/20/2010	SPS	REVIEW COMPLAINT AND PREPARE ANSWER.	1.20	462.00
05/24/2010	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ANSWER, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
	SPS	REVIEW PLEADINGS AND COMMUNICATE WITH CLIENT REGARDING ANSWER AND REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.	0.30	115.50
05/25/2010	SPS	REVIEW PLEADINGS AND CASE FILE IN PREPARATION FOR RULE 26 CONFERENCE.	0.50	192.50
05/26/2010	ANC	PREPARE COPYRIGHT ANALYSIS REGARDING SUBJECT DESIGNS, AND UPDATE SAME WITH CASE INFORMATION.	0.40	76.00
	SPS	PARTICIPATE IN RULE 26 CONFERENCE WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL AND PREPARE JOINT RULE 26 REPORT.	1.40	539.00
05/27/2010	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE JOINT RULE 26 REPORT AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
		CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	8.70	2,741.00

		RECAPITULATION		
<u>TIMEKEEPER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	4.40	\$385.00	\$1,694.00
BEN AMMERMAN	ASSOCIATE	2.30	290.00	667.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	2.00	190.00	380.00

05/24/2010	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	17.42
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	17.42
	TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	2,758.42

EXHIBIT D

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 2

05/31/2010

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 46789

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

BALANCE DUE

\$2,758.42

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
06/30/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 46978

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

06/03/2010	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE JUDGE WU'S STANDING ORDER; REVIEW ANSWER OF ROSS STORES, INC. AND JOINT RULE 26(f) REPORT; PREPARE CASE BINDER; REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER REGARDING SETTLEMENT PROCEDURE ASSIGNMENT; RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS REGARDING LOCAL RULES FOR SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	3.40	646.00
	MHC	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS. (NO CHARGE)	0.35	
06/04/2010	ANC	REVIEW NOTICE OF DEFICIENCIES REGARDING JOINT RULE 26(f) DISCOVERY PLAN.	0.20	38.00
06/08/2010	ANC	REVIEW NOTICE REGARDING CONTINUED SCHEDULING CONFERENCE AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.20	38.00
	SPS	REVIEW PLEADINGS AND CASE STATUS.	0.50	192.50
06/09/2010	SPS	REVISE MEMORANDUM REGARDING COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP.	0.75	288.75
06/11/2010	BPA	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CLIENT REQUESTING DOCUMENTS FOR FILE.	0.30	87.00
	SPS	ANALYZE PLEADINGS AND DEFENSE STRATEGY, INCLUDING REQUEST FOR RELEVANT INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTS.	1.20	462.00
06/13/2010	SPS	REVISE MEMORANDUM REGARDING COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP.	0.25	96.25
06/15/2010	ANC		0.60	114.00
	MHC	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS. (NO CHARGE)	0.25	
	SPS	ANALYZE PLEADINGS AND POTENTIAL STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS DEFENSE.	0.40	154.00
06/21/2010	BPA			

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 2
06/30/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 46978

REDACTED

		0.50	145.00
06/23/2010 BPA	REVIEW AND ANALYZE COMPLAINT, ANSWER AND PARTIES' INITIAL DISCLOSURES TO PREPARE FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE.	0.60	174.00
06/24/2010 BPA	PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND SCHEDULING CONFERENCE; PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING DEADLINES DISCUSSED AT SCHEDULING CONFERENCE.	4.80	1,392.00
ANC	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING SCHEDULING CONFERENCE AND PROPOSED PRETRIAL DEADLINES.	0.20	38.00
ANC	ASSEMBLE CASE PLEADINGS AND INITIAL DISCLOSURES; PREPARE CASE BINDER.	0.50	95.00
06/28/2010 BPA	REVIEW AND ANALYZE CO-DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S RULE 26 DISCLOSURES; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S RULE 26 DISCLOSURES.	0.40	116.00
ANC	REVIEW CASE PLEADINGS, ANSWERS FILED TO DATE, AND SCHEDULING ORDER, AND PREPARE CASE BINDER REGARDING SAME; REVIEW INITIAL DISCLOSURES OF DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK AND DOCUMENTS PRODUCED REGARDING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE SCHEDULING ORDER AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	3.30	627.00
SPS	ANALYZE DEFENSE STRATEGY AND ISSUES REGARDING DISCOVERY FROM PLAINTIFF AND THIRD PARTIES.	0.70	269.50
06/29/2010 ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S INITIAL DISCLOSURES; RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS REGARDING PENDING EVENTS AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
06/30/2010 BPA	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO CORRESPONDENCE FROM OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING RULE 26 CONFERENCE.	0.10	29.00
	CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	19.90	5,078.00

RECAPITULATION			
<u>TIMEKEEPER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	3.80	\$385.00
BEN AMMERMAN	ASSOCIATE	6.70	290.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	8.80	190.00
MATT CLAYTON	PARALEGAL	0.60	0.00

PARKING & MILEAGE	60.00
TOTAL EXPENSES	60.00
TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	5,138.00
PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING	\$2,758.42

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3
06/30/2010
1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 46978

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

BALANCE DUE

\$7,896.42

<u>0-30</u>	<u>31-60</u>	<u>61-90</u>	<u>91-120</u>	<u>121-150</u>	<u>151+</u>
7,896.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
07/31/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 47335

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

07/01/2010	BPA	PREPARE SET ONE INTERROGATORIES; PREPARE SET ONE REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION; PREPARE SET ONE REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION.	2.80	812.00
	ANC	REVIEW INITIAL CASE PLEADINGS AND ANSWERS FILED TO DATE, AND PREPARE CASE BINDER REGARDING SAME.	0.50	95.00
	MHC	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.35	38.50
07/06/2010	ANC	PREPARE AND UPDATE INDEX TO CASE PLEADINGS BINDER; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO J. CAMBE AT TITAN LEGAL REGARDING SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS ON THE FASHION BOOKSTORE, AND PROVIDE SERVICE INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING SAME.	0.70	133.00
07/07/2010	BPA	PREPARE SUBPOENA REGARDING RECORDS TO FASHION BOOKSTORE.	0.10	29.00
	ANC	PREPARE SUBPOENA FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO THE FASHION BOOKSTORE; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO J. CAMBE REGARDING SERVICE INSTRUCTIONS, AND TELEPHONE CALL WITH J. CAMBE REGARDING SAME.	1.30	247.00
	SPS	ANALYZE LEGAL ISSUES REGARDING LACK OF PROOF OF INFRINGEMENT.	0.10	38.50
07/08/2010	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE CASE PLEADINGS, INITIAL DISCLOSURES, AND DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED TO DATE; PREPARE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME; REVIEW DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY CHARMING CLICK INC.; CALENDARING REGARDING WET SEAL'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY.	2.00	380.00
	SPS	REVIEW DISCOVERY FROM PLAINTIFF AND CORRESPOND WITH CLIENT REGARDING SAME.	0.40	154.00
07/12/2010	BPA	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO PLAINTIFF REGARDING INFORMATION REGARDING SUBJECT DESIGN AND PURCHASE OF ALLEGED INFRINGING GARMENTS; PREPARE INTERROGATORIES TO PLAINTIFF; PREPARE REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION TO PLAINTIFF; PREPARE REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION TO PLAINTIFF; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S SET ONE DISCOVERY TO THE WET SEAL; PREPARE OUTLINE OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S SET ONE INTERROGATORIES; PREPARE OUTLINE OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S SET ONE REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION.	4.80	1,392.00
	ANC	REVIEW STATUS REPORT FROM TITAN LEGAL REGARDING SUBPOENA ON		

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 2
07/31/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 47335

	FASHION BOOKSTORE, AND PREPARE RESPONSE REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
07/13/2010	BPA CONTINUE PREPARING WRITTEN DISCOVERY TO PLAINTIFF; PREPARE RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S SET ONE INTERROGATORIES; PREPARE RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S SET ONE REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION.	4.30	1,247.00
	ANC REVIEW DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED TO PLAINTIFF, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
	SPS ANALYZE DISCOVERY STRATEGY, REQUESTS, AND INFORMATION NEEDED FOR RESPONSES.	0.50	192.50
	SPS REVISE MEMORANDUM REGARDING INVESTIGATIVE AND LITIGATION STRATEGIES.	0.10	38.50
07/14/2010	ANC REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE FROM TITAN LEGAL REGARDING CERTIFICATE OF NO RECORDS FROM THE FASHION BOOKSTORE.	0.20	38.00
07/19/2010	BPA REVIEW AND ANALYZE CORRESPONDENCE FROM OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING REQUEST FOR IMAGES OF ALLEGED INFRINGING GARMENTS, HANGTAGS AND RECEIPTS REGARDING SAME.	0.10	29.00
07/20/2010	BPA PREPARE INITIAL DISCLOSURES.	0.40	116.00
07/21/2010	BPA FINALIZE INITIAL DISCLOSURES; CORRESPONDENCE TO OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING IMAGES OF DESIGN, HANGTAGS AND RECEIPTS REGARDING ALLEGED INFRINGING GARMENTS.	0.20	58.00
07/22/2010	BPA REVIEW AND RESPOND TO CORRESPONDENCE FROM CLIENT; REVIEW AND ANALYZE CORRESPONDENCE FROM OPPOSING COUNSEL WITH IMAGES OF ALLEGED INFRINGING GARMENTS, HANGTAGS AND PURCHASE RECEIPTS; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CLIENT REGARDING IMAGES OF ALLEGED INFRINGING GARMENTS AND RELATION TO ALLEGATIONS IN COMPLAINT.	0.40	116.00
	ANC REVIEW INITIAL DISCLOSURES OF DEFENDANT, AND UPDATE CASE BINDER REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
07/23/2010	ANC REVIEW IMAGES OF ALLEGED GARMENTS, AND CORRESPONDENCE TO CLIENT REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
07/26/2010	SPS REVIEW COMPLAINT, EXHIBITS, AND DOCUMENTS FROM PLAINTIFF AND ANALYZE FACTS FOR DISCUSSION WITH CLIENT.	1.20	462.00
07/27/2010	SPS ANALYZE PLEADINGS, CLIENT DOCUMENTS, AND CASE STRATEGY.	0.40	154.00
07/29/2010	ANC REVIEW REPORT REGARDING SUBPOENA ON FASHION BOOKSTORE; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO J. CAMBE REGARDING SAME; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME.	1.00	190.00
07/30/2010	ANC REVIEW FASHION CLICK'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES.	0.30	57.00
	JOE CORRESPOND WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING DISCOVERY; STRATEGIZE REGARDING SAME; TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH J.		

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3
07/31/2010
1780-05M

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

STATEMENT #: 47335

SEDIVY REGARDING POTENTIAL TENDER OF DEFENSE; REVIEW
COMPLAINT REGARDING SAME.
CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED

1.80 558.00
25.25 6,822.00

RECAPITULATION				
<u>TIMEKEEPER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	2.70	\$385.00	\$1,039.50
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	1.80	310.00	558.00
BEN AMMERMAN	ASSOCIATE	13.10	290.00	3,799.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	7.30	190.00	1,387.00
MATT CLAYTON	PARALEGAL	0.35	110.00	38.50

PHOTOCOPIES	14.20
COMPUTERIZED ACCESS TO COURT RECORDS	7.68
TOTAL EXPENSES	21.88

07/06/2010	EVIDENCE	20.40
07/26/2010	SERVICE OF PROCESS, THE FASHION BOOKSTORE	76.13
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	96.53

TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	6,940.41
-----------------------	----------

PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING	\$7,896.42
-------------------------	------------

07/19/2010	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 551684	-2,758.42
07/19/2010	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 551684 (INTENDED FOR WET01-03, BUT THAT MATTER IS PAID IN FULL)	-2,889.50
08/09/2010	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 551815	-5,138.00
	TOTAL PAYMENTS	-10,785.92

BALANCE DUE	<u>\$4,050.91</u>
-------------	-------------------

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
08/31/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 47928

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

08/03/2010	JOE	MULTIPLE TELEPHONE CONFERENCES CONCERNING DESIGN PROVIDED TO WET SEAL.	0.80	248.00
08/04/2010	BPA	PREPARE CASE STRATEGY.	0.30	87.00
	JOE	STRATEGIZE REGARDING CASE TASKS AND OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY.	0.40	124.00
08/05/2010	ANC	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING DISCOVERY EXTENSION AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME; REVIEW DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION; REVIEW DOCUMENTS PRODUCED REGARDING SAME.	0.60	114.00
08/11/2010	JOE	STRATEGIZE REGARDING DISMISSAL OF OTHER CLAIMS AGAINST WET SEAL; STRATEGIZE REGARDING DISCOVERY PLAN; UPDATE WITH CLIENT REGARDING REMAINING CLAIMS.	3.30	1,023.00
	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS. (NO CHARGE)	0.35	
	SPS	ANALYZE CLIENT DOCUMENTS, COMPLAINT, AND CORRESPOND WITH CLIENT REGARDING SAME.	1.50	577.50
08/12/2010	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY RESPONSES AND DOCUMENTS PRODUCED; PREPARE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME; REVIEW DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED TO PLAINTIFF WET SEAL, AND DEFENDANT CHARMING CLICK, AND PREPARE DISCOVERY BINDERS AND INDEX REGARDING SAME.	3.00	570.00
08/13/2010	SPS	ANALYZE CASE STRATEGY, DIFFERENCES IN DESIGNS, LACK OF ACCESS, AND POTENTIAL FOR TENDER TO VENDOR.	1.30	500.50
08/18/2010	ANC	REVIEW DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S DISCOVERY RESPONSES; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
08/19/2010	JOE	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CLIENT REGARDING DISCOVERY	0.90	279.00
08/20/2010	ANC	REVIEW WET SEAL, INC.'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURES; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO WET SEAL, INC.'S REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION, REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION AND INTERROGATORIES; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME; REVIEW		

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 2
08/31/2010
1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 47928

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

	PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND PREPARE BINDER REGARDING SAME.	1.00	190.00
JOE	FINALIZE DISCOVERY RESPONSES; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CLIENTS.	2.10	651.00
08/23/2010 ANC	REVIEW DEFENDANT FASHION BUG'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY, DEFENDANT CHARMING SHOPPES' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY, AND PREPARE BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME; PREPARE DISCOVERY BINDER WITH PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS PRODUCED; UPDATE DISCOVERY INDEX REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED BY WET SEAL, INC.	2.30	437.00
08/24/2010 ANC	REVIEW DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES, SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES, AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION; PREPARE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME; REVIEW DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY FASHION CLICK, AND PREPARE DISCOVERY BINDER REGARDING SAME; REVIEW INITIAL DISCLOSURES FILED BY PLAINTIFF AND WET SEAL, UPDATE CASE BINDER REGARDING SAME.	1.80	342.00
JOE	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING SETTLEMENT AND DISCOVERY STATUS; STRATEGIZE REGARDING CASE RESOLUTION AND INDEMNITY WITH CLIENT; REVIEW FOUR SETS OF DISCOVERY RESPONSES SERVED BY OTHER DEFENDANTS.	2.00	620.00
SPS	REVIEW DISCOVERY REQUESTS AND ANALYZE INFORMATION FOR RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS.	0.80	308.00
08/25/2010 JOE	CORRESPOND WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL AND CLIENT REGARDING OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY.	0.50	155.00
SPS	REVIEW CASE STATUS AND DISCOVERY RESPONSES, AND CORRESPOND WITH CLIENT REGARDING UPDATE.	0.30	115.50
08/26/2010 ANC	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE FROM PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL REGARDING DISCOVERY EXTENSION, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.20	38.00
JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH CLIENT REGARDING		
	CALL BOX.	0.80	248.00
SPS	REVIEW CASE STATUS AND DISCOVERY EXTENSION.	0.20	77.00
08/31/2010 JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH CALL BOX REGARDING DESIGN ORIGIN AND INDEMNIFICATION; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING SAME.	0.80	248.00
SPS	ANALYZE DESIGNS AND EVIDENCE OF INDEPENDENT CREATION.	0.30	115.50
	CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	25.95	7,144.00

TIMEKEEPER		RECAPITULATION			
	TITLE	HOURS	RATE	TOTAL	
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	4.40	\$385.00	\$1,694.00	
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	11.60	310.00	3,596.00	

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3
08/31/2010
1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 47928

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

<u>TIMEKEEPER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
BEN AMMERMAN	ASSOCIATE	0.30	290.00	87.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	9.30	190.00	1,767.00
BRITTANY DAVISON	PARALEGAL	0.35	0.00	0.00

TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES 7,144.00

PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING \$4,050.91

09/07/2010 PAYMENT BY CHECK # 551966 -4,050.91

BALANCE DUE \$7,144.00

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
09/30/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 48375

REDACTED

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

09/02/2010	JOE	CORRESPOND WITH CALL BOX REGARDING ORIGIN OF DESIGN AND REVIEW COLOR PRINTS PROVIDED BY VENDOR TO CALL BOX.	0.80	248.00
09/03/2010	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCES WITH CLIENT AND WITH CALL BOX REGARDING CASE STRATEGY; REVIEW SUBPOENA FOR RECORDS OF LA PRINTEX BOOK PURCHASES.	1.10	341.00
09/07/2010	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH CUSTODIAN REGARDING RECORDS TO SUBPOENA AND FOLLOW UP WITH CLIENT REGARDING OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY.	0.80	248.00
09/08/2010	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS. (NO CHARGE)	0.60	
	JOE	FINALIZE DISCOVERY RESPONSES; TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH CLIENT REGARDING SAME; REVIEW PATTERNS; CORRESPONDENCE FROM CALL BOX REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION.	2.10	651.00
09/09/2010	JOE	FINALIZE DISCOVERY RESPONSES; REVIEW DOCUMENTS FOR POTENTIAL PRODUCTION.	1.50	465.00
09/10/2010	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH U.S. TEXTILE REGARDING ORIGIN OF DESIGN AND INDEMNIFICATION ISSUES.	0.50	155.00
	SPS	REVIEW AND ANALYZE CASE STATUS.	0.20	77.00
09/13/2010	SPS	ANALYZE DEFENSE STRATEGY AND POTENTIAL MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.70	269.50
09/16/2010	ANC	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE FROM F. KIM REGARDING ORIGINAL PATTERNS FROM U.S. TEXTILE, REVIEW PATTERNS REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
09/17/2010	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER REGARDING SAME; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO FASHION CLICK'S REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION.	0.60	114.00
09/27/2010	JOE	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CALL BOX REGARDING INDEMNITY;	1.50	465.00
09/29/2010	JOE	REVIEW STIPULATION BY OPPOSING COUNSEL; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CALL BOX REGARDING INDEMNITY.	0.30	93.00

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 2
09/30/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 48375

REDACTED

09/30/2010 ANC REVIEW STIPULATION FOR CONTINUANCE OF MEDIATION DATES AND
POST MEDIATION STATUS CONFERENCE DATES AND DEADLINES;
REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE TO F. KIM REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION. 0.40 76.00

SPS STRATEGIZE REGARDING POSSIBLE SUMMARY
JUDGMENT MOTION. 0.70 269.50
CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED 12.20 3,548.00

RECAPITULATION				
TIMEKEEPER	TITLE	HOURS	RATE	TOTAL
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	1.60	\$385.00	\$616.00
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	8.60	310.00	2,666.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	1.40	190.00	266.00
BRITTANY DAVISON	PARALEGAL	0.60	0.00	0.00

TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES 3,548.00

PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING \$7,144.00

BALANCE DUE \$10,692.00

0-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	121-150	151+
10,692.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
10/31/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 48996

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

10/04/2010	ANC	REVIEW DEPOSITION SUBPOENA TO CALL BOX APPAREL, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.20	38.00
	JOE	REVIEW DOCUMENTS TO BE PRODUCED BY WET SEAL; TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING SAME; CORRESPOND WITH COUNSEL FOR US TEXTILE.	1.30	403.00
	SPS	ANALYZE DEFENSE AND SETTLEMENT STRATEGIES.	0.40	154.00
10/05/2010	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE MEET AND CONFER CORRESPONDENCE FROM PLAINTIFF REGARDING WET SEAL INC.'S DISCOVERY RESPONSES, AND CALENDARING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE CLIENT DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE AND BATES LABEL SAME FOR DOCUMENT PRODUCTION.	1.20	228.00
	JOE	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CLIENT AND CORRESPONDENCE TO CALL BOX REGARDING SETTLEMENT AND STATUS.	0.80	248.00
10/06/2010	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE WET SEAL'S DISCOVERY RESPONSES AND SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS PRODUCED, AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER REGARDING SAME; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED BY FASHION CLICK, AND PREPARE DISCOVERY BINDER; REVIEW DISCOVERY RESPONSES OF MAX RAVE AND ROSS STORES, AND PREPARE BINDER REGARDING SAME; REVIEW STIPULATION TO CONTINUE MEDIATION AND NOTICE OF MEDIATION STATUS CONFERENCE, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	2.30	437.00
	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH	1.20	372.00
	JOE	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO COUNSEL AND STRATEGIZE REGARDING SAME.	1.10	341.00
	SPS	REVIEW AND ANALYZE DEFENSE AND INDEMNIFICATION ISSUES AND POSSIBLE SETTLEMENT.	0.30	115.50
10/07/2010	JOE	CORRESPOND WITH US TEXTILE'S COUNSEL; STRATEGIZE REGARDING CASE RESOLUTION.	0.80	248.00
	SPS	ANALYZE INDEMNIFICATION ISSUES AND CORRESPOND WITH COUNSEL FOR FABRIC SUPPLIER.	0.50	192.50

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 2
10/31/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 48996

10/08/2010	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH C. LESLIE REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION AND STRATEGY AS TO CALL BOX.	0.50	155.00
10/12/2010	JOE	REVIEW DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM CALL BOX; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CALL BOX REGARDING SAME.	0.50	155.00
10/14/2010	JOE	REVIEW DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM CALL BOX; STRATEGIZE REGARDING SAME.	0.80	248.00
	SPS	ANALYZE ISSUES REGARDING CALL BOX SUBPOENA AND INDEMNIFICATION.	0.40	154.00
10/18/2010	JOE	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO COUNSEL FOR US TEXTILE REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION; STRATEGIZE REGARDING SAME.	0.80	248.00
10/20/2010	JOE	PREPARE MULTIPLE CORRESPONDENCE TO COUNSEL FOR US TEXTILE REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION AND UPDATE CALL BOX REGARDING SAME.	1.30	403.00
	SPS	ANALYZE INDEMNIFICATION AND CASE MANAGEMENT ISSUES.	0.30	115.50
10/21/2010	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE AMENDED DISCOVERY RESPONSES OF FASHION BUG RETAIL; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE AMENDED DISCOVERY RESPONSES OF CHARMING SHOPPES; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME.	1.00	190.00
	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH C. LESLIE REGARDING CASE STRATEGY; REVIEW DISCOVERY RESPONSES OF OTHER DEFENDANTS; REVIEW STIPULATION PROPOSED BY C. LESLIE.	0.80	248.00
	SPS	REVIEW AND ANALYZE INDEMNIFICATION ISSUES.	0.20	77.00
10/25/2010	ANC	REVIEW DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S DISCOVERY TO PLAINTIFF; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME.	0.40	76.00
10/26/2010	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE CORRESPONDENCE FROM C. LESLIE REGARDING SETTLEMENT ISSUES AND INDEMNIFICATION ISSUES REGARDING CALL BOX; REVIEW JOINT STIPULATION TO CONTINUE DISCOVERY CUT-OFF DATES AND DEADLINES.	0.40	76.00
	JOE	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CALL BOX REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION AND PAYMENTS TO WET SEAL; STRATEGIZE REGARDING SAME.	0.60	186.00
	SPS	REVIEW INDEMNIFICATION ISSUES AND CONTACT COUNSEL FOR FABRIC SUPPLIER.	0.20	77.00
10/27/2010	ANC	REVIEW DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY DEFENDANT CHARMING SHOPPES; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER REGARDING SAME; REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE FROM S. WINTER REGARDING AMENDED DISCOVERY RESPONSES OF DEFENDANTS CHARMING SHOPPES AND FASHION BUG RETAIL.	0.40	76.00
	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH F. KIM REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION		

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 3
10/31/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 48996

	AND ISSUES WITH US TEXTILE; REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE FROM US TEXTILE.	0.50	155.00
10/28/2010 ANC	REVIEW ORDER REGARDING STIPULATION TO CONTINUE FACT AND EXPERT DISCOVERY DATES; REVIEW MINUTES OF SCHEDULING CONFERENCE REGARDING TRIAL DATES, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
	CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	19.50	5,473.50

TIMEKEEPER		RECAPITULATION		
	TITLE	HOURS	RATE	TOTAL
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	2.30	\$385.00	\$885.50
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	11.00	310.00	3,410.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	6.20	190.00	1,178.00

10/20/2010	ONLINE LEGAL RESEARCH	32.94
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	32.94
	TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	5,506.44
	PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING	\$10,692.00
10/25/2010	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 552305	-7,144.00
11/08/2010	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 552429	-3,548.00
	TOTAL PAYMENTS	-10,692.00
	BALANCE DUE	<u>\$5,506.44</u>

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
11/30/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 49262

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

11/03/2010	JOE	PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO WET SEAL; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CALL BOX REGARDING CASE STATUS AND POTENTIAL SETTLEMENT.	0.60	186.00
	SPS	ANALYZE CASE STATUS; CORRESPOND WITH CRAIG LESLIE REGARDING DEFENSE STRATEGY.	0.50	192.50
11/04/2010	SGB	RESEARCH REGARDING INDEMNITY.	0.20	54.00
	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE JOINT STIPULATION REGARDING DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S MOTION TO COMPEL RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION; REVIEW NOTICES OF DEFICIENCIES REGARDING SAME; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL RULE 26 DISCLOSURES; UPDATE CASE BINDER REGARDING SAME.	1.00	190.00
	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH WET SEAL AND TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH CALL BOX REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION PROGRESS AND POTENTIAL FOR RESOLUTION.	0.50	155.00
11/05/2010	ANC	REVIEW PLEADINGS AND STIPULATION FILED IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S SECOND MOTION TO COMPEL PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY RESPONSES; REVIEW SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY PLAINTIFF AND PRIVILEGE LOG REGARDING SAME; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME.	0.90	171.00
	JOE	MULTIPLE TELEPHONE CONFERENCES WITH CALL BOX AND WET SEAL REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION AND	0.80	248.00
11/08/2010	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.30	33.00
	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED TO UNO CLOTHING; PREPARE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME.	0.60	114.00
	SPS	ANALYZE PRIOR DESIGN, CORRESPOND WITH CO-COUNSEL, AND REVIEW CASE STRATEGY REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION.	0.30	115.50
11/09/2010	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.70	77.00
	JOE	REVIEW ADDITIONAL PRINTS; REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE TO ALL COUNSEL REGARDING SAME.	0.20	62.00
	SPS	ANALYZE POTENTIAL GROUNDS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.20	77.00

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 2
11/30/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 49262

REDACTED

11/11/2010	ANC	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING SERVICE OF COMPLAINT ON NORDSTROM.	0.10	19.00
	JOE	CORRESPOND REGARDING MEDIATION STRATEGY; TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH CALL BOX REGARDING MOVING CASE FORWARD WITH INDEMNITY OBLIGATION.	0.50	155.00
11/15/2010	JOE	CORRESPOND WITH ALL COUNSEL	0.20	62.00
11/16/2010	ANC	REVIEW NOTICE OF MEDIATION AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
11/17/2010	ANC	REVIEW JAMS MEDIATION AGREEMENT AND CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING SAME; CALENDAR RELATED DEADLINES; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S MOTION TO COMPEL.	0.60	114.00
11/18/2010	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S MOTION TO COMPEL; REVIEW PRIVILEGE LOG OF PLAINTIFF; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER REGARDING SAME.	0.50	95.00
11/19/2010	ANC	REVIEW ORDER VACATING MOTION TO COMPEL HEARING; CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
11/22/2010	ANC	REVIEW ORDER VACATING DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S MOTION TO COMPEL, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME; REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE FROM JAMS REGARDING ADDITIONAL MEDIATION DEADLINES, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.50	95.00
	JOE	CORRESPOND WITH CALL BOX REGARDING INDEMNITY; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO WET SEAL REGARDING SAME.	0.50	155.00
11/23/2010	ANC	REVIEW ANSWER OF DEFENDANT NORDSTROM, INC.; REVIEW UPCOMING MEDIATION DATES AND REVIEW RULES REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
	JOE	TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH ALL DEFENSE COUNSEL	0.50	155.00
11/24/2010	JOE	CORRESPOND WITH ALL COUNSEL	0.20	62.00
11/29/2010	JOE	CORRESPOND WITH ALL COUNSEL; PREPARE FOR MEDIATION.	0.50	155.00
11/30/2010	ANC	REVIEW SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS OF B. VANDERHOOF AND R. YEH, IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO COMPEL; REVIEW FASHION CLICK'S DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED TO PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES, AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER REGARDING SAME; REVIEW DISCOVERY PROPOUNDED TO NORDSTROM INC., AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER REGARDING SAME.	1.70	323.00
	JOE	PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND MEDIATION; UPDATE WITH CLIENTS REGARDING SAME.	7.50	2,325.00
		CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	21.10	5,580.00

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3

11/30/2010

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 49262

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

<u>TIMEKEEPER</u>	<u>RECAPITULATION</u> <u>TITLE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	1.00	\$385.00	\$385.00
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	12.00	310.00	3,720.00
SAM BROOKS	ASSOCIATE	0.20	270.00	54.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	6.90	190.00	1,311.00
BRITTANY DAVISON	PARALEGAL	1.00	110.00	110.00

PARKING & MILEAGE 90.10

TOTAL EXPENSES 90.10

11/22/2010 MEDIATION FEE, JAMS, INC. 1,475.00

11/23/2010 PARCEL SERVICE, L. HART 11.79

TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS 1,486.79

TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES 7,156.89

PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING \$5,506.44

BALANCE DUE \$12,663.33

<u>0-30</u>	<u>31-60</u>	<u>61-90</u>	<u>91-120</u>	<u>121-150</u>	<u>151+</u>
12,663.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
12/31/2010
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 49684

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

12/01/2010	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO FASHION CLICK'S INTERROGATORIES; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME.	0.40	76.00
12/02/2010	JOE	ATTEND TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING.	0.80	248.00
12/03/2010	ANC	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING HEARING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO ADD PARTIES; CALENDARING REGARDING SAME; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED TO CHARMING SHOPPES; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES PROPOUNDED TO FASHION BUG; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME.	0.80	152.00
12/07/2010	JOE	PREPARE INDEMNIFICATION LETTER FOR USTP; STRATEGIZE REGARDING SAME.	1.60	496.00
	ANC	REVIEW COURT MINUTES REGARDING POST MEDIATION STATUS CONFERENCE.	0.10	19.00
12/08/2010	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND COMPLAINT, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE OF CHARMING SHOPPES, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME; REVIEW COURT ORDER REGARDING FASHION CLICK'S MOTION TO COMPEL; REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE TO CLIENT REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION.	1.10	209.00
12/09/2010	ANC	REVIEW SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY PLAINTIFF; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
12/14/2010	SPS	RESEARCH AND ANALYZE DAMAGES.	0.55	211.75
12/16/2010	ANC	REVIEW DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND; REVIEW JOINDER OF CHARMING SHOPPES AND FASHION BUG TO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND.	0.50	95.00
12/17/2010	MHC	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.95	104.50
12/20/2010	SPS	ANALYZE ISSUES REGARDING DEFENSE OF CASE ON THE MERITS.	0.60	231.00

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 2

12/31/2010

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 49684

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES

C&J MATTER WET01-05

12/21/2010	MHC	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.55	60.50
	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES OF MAX RAVE, LLC AND ROSS STORES, INC., AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
12/23/2010	ANC	REVIEW ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND.	0.20	38.00
12/27/2010	JOE	REVIEW STIPULATIONS FOR TRIAL DATES AND CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING OUTSTANDING DISCOVERY.	0.50	155.00
	SPS	ANALYZE LITIGATION STRATEGY, DEADLINES, AND POSSIBLE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.50	192.50
12/28/2010	ANC	REVIEW SIGNED PROTECTIVE ORDER; REVIEW NOTICE OF CONTINUED DEPOSITION OF LA PRINTEX WITH REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION, AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME; REVIEW DISCOVERY RESPONSES OF MAX RAVE, LLC TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME.	0.90	171.00
	JOE	PREPARE UPDATE TO WET SEAL; CORRESPONDENCE WITH ALL COUNSEL.	0.50	155.00
12/29/2010	SPS	CORRESPOND WITH CLIENT REGARDING CASE UPDATE.	0.30	115.50
12/31/2010	MHC	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.80	88.00
	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW MOTION TO COMPEL.	0.10	19.00
		CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	12.55	2,988.75

TIMEKEEPER		RECAPITULATION		
	TITLE	HOURS	RATE	TOTAL
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	1.95	\$385.00	\$750.75
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	3.40	310.00	1,054.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	4.90	190.00	931.00
MATT CLAYTON	PARALEGAL	2.30	110.00	253.00

PHOTOCOPIES 42.20

TOTAL EXPENSES 42.20

TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES 3,030.95

PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING \$12,663.33

12/13/2010 PAYMENT BY CHECK # 552638 -5,506.44

01/10/2011 PAYMENT BY CHECK # 552778 -7,156.89

TOTAL PAYMENTS -12,663.33

BALANCE DUE \$3,030.95

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3
12/31/2010
1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 49684

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
01/31/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 50217

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

01/02/2011	SPS	ANALYZE APPORTIONMENT.	0.30	115.50
01/03/2011	ALR	PREPARE NOTICE OF APPEARANCE; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING CLAIMS AND DEFENSES IN PREPARATION FOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION.	1.50	435.00
01/04/2011	ANC	REVIEW NOTICES OF DEPOSITION OF L.A. PRINTEX AND D. JUNG AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER GRANTING CONTINUANCE OF SCHEDULING ORDER BY 60 DAYS.	0.10	29.00
01/05/2011	ANC	REVIEW COURT ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL.	0.10	19.00
01/07/2011	JOE	REVIEW COURT ORDERS; TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH NEW COUNSEL FOR ULTIMATE INDEMNITOR.	0.50	155.00
	ALR	PREPARE NOTICE OF APPEARANCE.	0.10	29.00
01/09/2011	ANC	REVIEW NOTICE OF AMENDED DEPOSITIONS OF L.A. PRINTEX AND D. JUNG AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME; REVIEW SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE OF MAX RAVE TO MOTION TO COMPEL AND NOTE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME.	0.50	95.00
01/12/2011	ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF CHARMING SHOPPES AND ALTERNATE LOCATIONS AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME; REVIEW COURT ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL.	0.70	133.00
01/13/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL AND NOTE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME.	0.20	38.00
01/14/2011	ALR	ANALYZE CASE STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT.	0.20	58.00
01/17/2011	ANC	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE FROM K. CISNEROS OF JAMS REGARDING CASE STATUS AND CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.20	38.00
	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.90	99.00
01/18/2011	ALR	PREPARE COPYRIGHT CASE MATRIX.	0.40	116.00

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 2
01/31/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 50217

01/19/2011	SPS	ANALYZE DEFENSE STRATEGY AND CORRESPOND WITH COUNSEL FOR VENDOR REGARDING INDEMNIFICATION.	0.60	231.00
01/21/2011	JOE	STRATEGIZE REGARDING POTENTIAL MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; STRATEGIZE FOR NEW COUNSEL FOR US TEXTILE.	0.50	155.00
	ALR	ANALYSIS REGARDING INDEMNIFICATIONS AND CASE STRATEGY.	0.20	58.00
	SPS	ANALYZE DEFENSE STRATEGY AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DISCUSS SAME WITH CLIENT.	0.60	231.00
01/24/2011	JOE	STRATEGIZE REGARDING CASE DESIGNS AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ARGUMENTS.	1.50	465.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYZE CO-DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF LA PRINTEX AND D. JUNG; COMMUNICATE WITH CO-DEFENDANTS REGARDING SAME; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING WRITTEN DISCOVERY, CASE DEVELOPMENT, AND PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION; PREPARE FOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION.	2.40	696.00
01/25/2011	ANC	REVIEW CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF DEPOSITION OF CHARMING SHOPPES, INC.; CALENDARING REGARDING SAME.	0.20	38.00
	ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS AND CASE RESOLUTION; PREPARE FOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION.	2.50	725.00
	SPS	ANALYZE CASE STATUS, DEFENSE STRATEGY, AND CORRESPOND WITH CLIENT REGARDING SAME.	0.80	308.00
01/26/2011	ALR	PREPARE FOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION.	5.10	1,479.00
01/27/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER GRANTING CONTINUANCE OF SCHEDULING ORDER DATES AND TRIAL DEADLINES AND CALENDAR SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE JUDGE WU'S STANDING ORDER REGARDING FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE; CALENDAR DEADLINES AND PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME.	2.20	418.00
	ALR	CORRESPOND WITH CO-DEFENDANTS REGARDING PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITIONS.	0.20	58.00
01/31/2011	JOE	REVIEW SIMILAR DESIGNS FOR OTHER SOURCES; STRATEGIZE REGARDING SAME.	0.80	248.00
	ALR	ANALYZE PRIOR ARTWORK IDENTIFIED AS SIMILAR TO SUBJECT DESIGNS.	0.80	232.00
	ALR	ANALYSIS REGARDING CASE STRATEGY AND MANAGEMENT.	0.30	87.00
		CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	24.70	6,845.50
		COURTESY DISCOUNT		-1,000.00
				5,845.50

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3

01/31/2011

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 50217

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

		RECAPITULATION		
<u>TIMEKEEPER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	2.30	\$385.00	\$885.50
AARON RENFRO	ASSOCIATE	13.80	290.00	4,002.00
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	3.30	310.00	1,023.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	4.40	190.00	836.00
BRITTANY DAVISON	PARALEGAL	0.90	110.00	99.00
01/07/2011	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			46.02
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS			46.02
	TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES			5,891.52
	PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING			\$3,030.95
01/17/2011	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 552829			-695.50
02/07/2011	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 552971			-3,030.95
02/14/2011	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 171312, JAMS, REFUND			-400.00
	TOTAL PAYMENTS			-4,126.45
	BALANCE DUE			<u>\$4,796.02</u>

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
02/28/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 50750

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

02/01/2011	ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING WRITTEN DISCOVERY.	0.10	29.00
02/02/2011	ALR	ANALYSIS REGARDING LITIGATION STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT.	0.20	58.00
	SPS	ANALYZE DISCOVERY STATUS AND MEET AND CONFER REGARDING SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND CORRESPOND WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING SAME.	0.30	115.50
02/04/2011	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PRIOR ARTWORK/DESIGNS IN PREPARATION FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT REGARDING ACCESS.	0.20	58.00
	SPS	REVIEW AND ANALYZE STRATEGY FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND LACK OF PROOF OF ACCESS.	0.40	154.00
02/07/2011	JOE	STRATEGIZE REGARDING TRIAL TASKS AND POTENTIAL MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	2.30	713.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PRIOR ARTWORK REGARDING ACCESS ISSUES.	0.30	87.00
	SPS	ANALYZE DEFENSE STRATEGIES	0.40	154.00
02/08/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE DOCUMENTS REGARDING CHINA TEXTILE PATTERNS IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN, VOLUMES 1 THROUGH 15, IN PREPARATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURES; PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME; PREPARE SUPPLEMENTAL RULE 26 DISCLOSURES AND FINALIZE SAME.	0.90	171.00
	ALR	PREPARE PRIOR ARTWORK/DESIGNS FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE SUPPLEMENTAL RULE 26 DISCLOSURES; PREPARE WRITTEN DISCOVERY REQUESTS.	1.40	406.00
02/09/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO CHARMING SHOPPES INC.'S INTERROGATORIES, REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO FASHION CLICK'S INTERROGATORIES; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE NORDSTROM INC.'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION REGARDING SAME; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE OF CHARMING SHOPPES,		

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 2

02/28/2011

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 50750

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES

C&J MATTER WET01-05

	INC. AND FASHION BUG TO PLAINTIFF'S INTERROGATORIES; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME.	1.50	285.00
ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PRIOR ARTWORK IN PUBLIC DOMAIN REGARDING ORIGINALITY AND ACCESS ISSUES.	0.20	58.00
ALR	PREPARE WRITTEN DISCOVERY REQUESTS.	0.70	203.00
02/10/2011 ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED NOTICES OF DEPOSITION OF DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK INC.'S PERSON MOST QUALIFIED AND NORDSTROM INC.'S PERSON MOST QUALIFIED; CALENDAR RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES.	0.50	95.00
ALR	PREPARE WRITTEN DISCOVERY REQUESTS.	1.10	319.00
02/11/2011 SPS	MEET AND CONFER WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.30	115.50
02/14/2011 ALR	PREPARE WRITTEN DISCOVERY TO PLAINTIFFS.	0.40	116.00
02/15/2011 ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE INTERROGATORIES, REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION AND REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION PROPOUNDED TO PLAINTIFF; CALENDAR RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME.	0.40	76.00
02/22/2011 ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYZE CO-DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS.	0.40	116.00
02/27/2011 ALR	PREPARE FOR DEPOSITIONS OF L.A. PRINTEX PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE AND D. JUNG.	3.10	899.00
MAY	UPDATE DISCOVERY DEADLINES.	0.30	57.00
02/28/2011 ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DEADLINES.	0.30	57.00
ALR	PREPARE FOR DEPOSITION OF L.A. PRINTEX PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE.	6.90	2,001.00
SPS	ANALYZE ISSUES IN ADVANCE OF DEPOSITION.	0.50	192.50
	CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	23.10	6,535.50

RECAPITULATION				
TIMEKEEPER	TITLE	HOURS	RATE	TOTAL
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	1.90	\$385.00	\$731.50
AARON RENFRO	ASSOCIATE	15.00	290.00	4,350.00
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	2.30	310.00	713.00
MARIAM A. YUSUF	PARALEGAL	0.30	190.00	57.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	3.60	190.00	684.00

TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	6,535.50
-----------------------	----------

PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING	\$4,796.02
-------------------------	------------

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 3
02/28/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 50750

03/14/2011	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 553200	-4,796.02
	BALANCE DUE	<u>\$6,535.50</u>

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
03/31/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 51115

REDACTED

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

03/01/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT PRODUCTION, AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME;	0.40	76.00
	ALR	PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND DEPOSITION OF L.A. PRINTEX'S PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE.	14.10	4,089.00
03/02/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE AMENDED NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF FASHION CLICK PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES.	0.30	57.00
	JOE	STRATEGIZE REGARDING NO NEED FOR EXPERTS; TRIAL STRATEGY REGARDING SAME.	0.50	155.00
	ALR	CORRESPONDENCE WITH COUNSEL REGARDING MEET AND CONFER REGARDING FURTHER PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION TESTIMONY.	0.50	145.00
03/03/2011	ALR	CORRESPONDENCE WITH PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL REGARDING CONTINUATION OF L.A. PRINTEX PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION AND STIPULATION TO MODIFY SCHEDULING ORDER.	0.20	58.00
03/04/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE MOTION TO COMPEL DEPOSITION OF PLAINTIFF'S WITNESSES; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES.	0.20	38.00
03/07/2011	JOE	STRATEGIZE REGARDING TRIAL DEADLINES AND DESIGN STYLES.	0.30	93.00
03/08/2011	ALR	CORRESPONDENCE WITH COUNSEL FOR ALL PARTIES REGARDING CONTINUATION OF L.A. PRINTEX PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION.	0.10	29.00
03/09/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE AMENDED NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF L.A. PRINTEX, AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES; REVIEW AND ANALYZE DEPOSITION SUBPOENAS TO U.S. TEXTILE PRINTING, INC. AND CALIFORNIA BLUE, INC., AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES.	0.60	114.00
	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE AND INDEX SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.80	88.00

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 2
03/31/2011
1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 51115

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS.	0.10	29.00
03/10/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS PRODUCED, AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE AMENDED NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF L.A. PRINTEX, AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES.	0.40	76.00
	SPS	ANALYZE COMPLAINT AND OUTLINE EVIDENCE NEEDED FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION.	0.30	115.50
	ALR	CORRESPONDENCE WITH COUNSEL REGARDING CONTINUING L.A. PRINTEX PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION; REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF SUBPOENAS TO U.S. TEXTILE AND CALIFORNIA BLUE.	0.40	116.00
03/11/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS PRODUCED BY DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX.	0.30	57.00
03/14/2011	ANC	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT SERVICE AND HEARING DEADLINES; TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH DISTRICT CLERK J. GONZALEZ REGARDING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT HEARING DATES; PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE NOTICE REGARDING WET SEAL'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT HEARING, AND CALENDAR RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES.	1.00	190.00
	ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FILING.	0.20	58.00
03/15/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE NOTICE OF VACATING HEARING ON FASHION CLICK'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME.	0.20	38.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF COURT ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANT FASHION CLICK'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FILING, CALENDARING, AND PROCEDURES.	0.40	116.00
03/18/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER VACATING MOTION TO COMPEL DEPOSITION OF PLAINTIFF'S PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE WITNESS, AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE NOTICE OF DEPOSITION OF PERSON MOST QUALIFIED OF NORDSTROM, INC., AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO WET SEAL'S DISCOVERY, AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME.	0.60	114.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF ORDER DENYING CO-DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION TESTIMONY.	0.20	58.00
	ALR	LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS IN PREPARATION FOR FILING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS IN		

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3
03/31/2011
1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 51115

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

	PREPARATION FOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE DEPOSITION.	2.40	696.00
03/21/2011 ANC	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING SERVICE DEADLINES FOR WET SEAL'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00
ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSES TO WRITTEN DISCOVERY; ANALYSIS REGARDING LITIGATION STRATEGY; LEGAL RESEARCH IN PREPARATION FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	5.70	1,653.00
SPS	REVIEW DISCOVERY RESPONSES AND DOCUMENTS AND ANALYZE ISSUES IN ADVANCE OF DEPOSITION; ANALYZE PLEADING, EVIDENCE, AND LAW IN PREPARATION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION.	2.80	1,078.00
03/22/2011 ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT PRODUCTION AND UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX REGARDING SAME; PREPARE DECLARATIONS OF S. SHAW AND A. CABRIALES FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; REVIEW AND ANALYZE CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT OF J. NAH AND D. JUNG AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT OF D. JUNG REGARDING RELEVANT EXCERPTS FOR PREPARATION OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	2.40	456.00
ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND WRITTEN DISCOVERY RESPONSES; PREPARE FOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE HEARING, INCLUDING ANALYSIS OF PRIOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE TESTIMONY BY L.A. PRINTEX'S D. JUNG; PREPARE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	4.80	1,392.00
SPS	REVIEW PLEADINGS AND PREPARE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE; REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S DOCUMENTS AND PREPARE FOR DEPOSITION OF PLAINTIFF'S PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE.	3.30	1,270.50
03/23/2011 ANC	PREPARE UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT OFFICE LITIGATION STATEMENT TO OBTAIN CERTIFIED COPYRIGHT REGISTRATION; REVIEW AND ANALYZE CLIENT DOCUMENTS PERTAINING TO WET SEAL CONTEMPO GARMENT AND PLAINTIFF'S DESIGN; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PRINT IMAGES; PREPARE DESIGN ANALYSIS SUMMARY FOR MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES; REVIEW AND ANALYZE VOLUMES 1 THROUGH 14 OF CHINESE TEXTILE PATTERNS REGARDING ANIMAL PRINT COMPARISONS; PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME; PREPARE EXHIBITS TO S. SHAW DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	7.90	1,501.00
JOE	REVIEW FOR CALL BOX INFORMATION; STRATEGIZE REGARDING SAME.	0.60	186.00
MAY	ASSIST WITH ORGANIZING EVIDENCE FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.80	152.00
MEV	REVIEW DRAFT LITIGATION STATEMENT ORDER FORM; PREPARE MEMORANDUM TO FILE REGARDING PREPARATION OF WRITTEN REQUEST.	0.30	115.50

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 4

03/31/2011

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 51115

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

REDACTED

ALR	PREPARE CALL BOX DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE FOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE HEARING, INCLUDING ANALYSIS OF PRIOR PERSON MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE TESTIMONY BY L.A. PRINTEX'S D. JUNG; PREPARE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, INCLUDING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES AND WET SEAL DECLARATION.	8.70	2,523.00
SPS	REVIEW AND REVISE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND SUPPORTING DECLARATIONS.	3.30	1,270.50
03/24/2011 ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE DRAFT MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; REVISE SAME; PREPARE DECLARATION OF S. SHAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; REVIEW AND ANALYZE VOLUMES 1 THROUGH 14 OF CHINESE TEXTILE PATTERNS REGARDING SIMILAR ANIMAL PRINT PATTERNS FOR SUPPORTING EXHIBITS TO S. SHAW DECLARATION; RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS REGARDING DESIGN COMPARISONS AND ANIMAL PRINT PATTERNS; COMPILE IMAGES OF SAME FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT SUPPORTING EXHIBITS.	7.30	1,387.00
MEV	MEET WITH COPYRIGHT OFFICE TO REQUEST LITIGATION STATEMENT AND CERTIFICATION OF MATERIALS.	2.00	770.00
ALR	PREPARE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, INCLUDING POINTS AND AUTHORITIES, CALL BOX DECLARATION, AND WET SEAL DECLARATION; REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF CO-DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	6.20	1,798.00
SPS	PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND DEPOSITION OF PLAINTIFF'S WITNESS J. NAH.	4.80	1,848.00
03/25/2011 ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE DECLARATION OF WET SEAL IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND PREPARE SUPPORTING EXHIBITS; REVIEW AND ANALYZE DECLARATION OF F. KIM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND PREPARE SUPPORTING EXHIBITS; RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS REGARDING ANIMAL PRINT PATTERNS IN THE PUBLIC DOMAIN; COMPILE IMAGES OF SAME FOR DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE LETTER TO UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE REGARDING LITIGATION STATEMENT; PREPARE DECLARATION REGARDING ANIMAL PRINT PATTERNS; PREPARE SUPPORTING EXHIBITS TO SAME.	7.10	1,349.00
MEV	TELEPHONE CALL FROM COPYRIGHT OFFICE; PREPARE MEMORANDUM TO FILE REGARDING COPYRIGHT OFFICE REQUEST FOR WRITTEN COVER LETTER.	0.20	77.00
ALR	PREPARE CALL BOX DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND COMMUNICATE WITH DECLARANT REGARDING SAME; PREPARE WET SEAL DECLARATION, POINTS AND AUTHORITIES, AND SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL DISCOVERY RESPONSES;	6.10	1,769.00

THE WET SEAL, INC.

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

PAGE: 5
03/31/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 51115

	SPS	COMMUNICATE WITH CLIENT AND CO-COUNSEL REGARDING SUMMARY JUDGMENT STRATEGY; REVISE MOTION.	2.00	770.00
03/26/2011	SPS	RESEARCH AND ANALYZE LAW REGARDING COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP OF FOREIGN WORKS.	0.50	192.50
03/27/2011	ALR	LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS REGARDING DEVELOPMENT OF DISPOSITIVE ARGUMENTS WITHIN ITALIAN COPYRIGHT LAW AND THE BERNE CONVENTION FOR WORKS ORIGINATING OUTSIDE THE U.S.	1.10	319.00
03/28/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE VOLUMES 2 THROUGH 14 OF CHINESE TEXTILE PATTERNS REGARDING SIMILAR WET SEAL ANIMAL PATTERNS FOR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE EXHIBITS TO S. SHAW DECLARATION; REVISE A. RENFRO DECLARATION AND FINALIZE SAME; REVISE EXHIBITS TO A. RENFRO DECLARATION AND FINALIZE SAME; EDIT A. CABRIALES DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; REVISE EXHIBITS TO SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION RESPONSES AND SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS PRODUCED; UPDATE DISCOVERY BINDER AND INDEX TO SAME; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING JUDGE WU'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FILING PROCEDURES.	8.00	1,520.00
	ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE POINTS AND AUTHORITIES, S. SHAW DECLARATION, A. RENFRO DECLARATION, AND SEPARATE STATEMENT.	7.50	2,175.00
	SPS	PREPARE AND FINALIZE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, STATEMENT OF UNCONTROVERTED FACTS AND LAW, AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.	4.80	1,848.00
03/29/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE DEFENDANT UNO CLOTHING, INC.'S AND CO-DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER REGARDING STIPULATION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY CUT-OFF AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME.	1.00	190.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF CO-DEFENDANT MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS REGARDING DEVELOPMENT OF DISPOSITIVE ARGUMENTS WITHIN ITALIAN COPYRIGHT LAW AND THE BERNE CONVENTION FOR WORKS ORIGINATING OUTSIDE THE U.S.	0.80	232.00
03/30/2011	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE AND INDEX SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.40	44.00
03/31/2011	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE AND INDEX SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	1.30	143.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND STRATEGY FOR OPPOSING SAME.	1.50	435.00
		CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	128.10	35,145.50

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 6

03/31/2011

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 51115

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES

C&J MATTER WET01-05

TIMEKEEPER	RECAPITULATION TITLE	HOURS	RATE	TOTAL
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	21.80	\$385.00	\$8,393.00
MELINDA EVANS	OF COUNSEL	2.50	385.00	962.50
AARON RENFRO	ASSOCIATE	61.00	290.00	17,690.00
JOHN T. EGLEY	ASSOCIATE	1.40	310.00	434.00
MARIAM A. YUSUF	PARALEGAL	0.80	190.00	152.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	38.10	190.00	7,239.00
BRITTANY DAVISON	PARALEGAL	2.50	110.00	275.00

PHOTOCOPIES 15.60

PARKING & MILEAGE 66.03

TOTAL EXPENSES 81.63

02/08/2011 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES, M. CURRAN 175.00

02/16/2011 FASHION DESIGN/ PATTERN BOOKS 28.89

03/01/2011 TRANSCRIPT, DEPOSITION OF D. JUNG 942.00

03/12/2011 FASHION DESIGN/PATTERN BOOK 2.78

03/24/2011 LITIGATION STATEMENT FEE, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS COPYRIGHT OFFICE 565.55

03/24/2011 TRANSCRIPT, DEPOSITION OF J. NAH 744.95

03/25/2011 CONFERENCE CALL 24.70

TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS 2,483.87

TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES 37,711.00

PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING \$6,535.50

04/04/2011 PAYMENT BY CHECK # 553337 -6,535.50

BALANCE DUE \$37,711.00

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
 PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
 12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
 FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
04/30/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 51619

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

04/01/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S PARTIAL MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.90	171.00
	SPS	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND PREPARE OPPOSITION.	2.00	770.00
04/02/2011	SPS	PREPARE OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	3.50	1,347.50
04/04/2011	ANC	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S PARTIAL MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE DECLARATION OF S. SHAW IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION AND PREPARE EXHIBITS TO SAME; REVIEW AND ANALYZE RELEVANT PORTIONS OF DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPTS OF J. NAH AND D. JUNG AND UPDATE OPPOSITION WITH TRANSCRIPT REFERENCES TO SAME.	9.20	1,748.00
	MAY	RESEARCH REGARDING CITATIONS.	0.50	95.00
	ALR	PREPARE OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING SAME; PREPARE DECLARATIONS OF A. RENFRO AND M. LOCARNO, OBJECTIONS TO J. NAH DECLARATION, AND OBJECTIONS TO SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNCONTROVERTED FACTS.	9.00	2,610.00
	SPS	PREPARE AND REVISE OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S EVIDENCE.	3.30	1,270.50
04/05/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE COMBINED OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES; PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME.	0.50	95.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO WET SEAL'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND CO-DEFENDANT BRIEFINGS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; LEGAL RESEARCH REGARDING NEW CASE LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT REGARDING ITALIAN LAW AND OWNERSHIP ISSUES; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF WET SEAL'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	2.90	841.00

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 2
04/30/2011
1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 51619

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

04/06/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S DESIGN FOR PREPARATION OF REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO WET SEAL'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.20	38.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO WET SEAL'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND CO-DEFENDANT BRIEFINGS; DEVELOP LEGAL ANALYSIS, STRUCTURE AND ARGUMENTS FOR REPLY BRIEF.	4.70	1,363.00
04/07/2011	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND CO-DEFENDANT BRIEFINGS; ADDITIONAL LEGAL RESEARCH OF CASE LAW RAISED IN OPPOSITION BRIEFINGS; PREPARE REPLY BRIEF.	6.30	1,827.00
04/08/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE EX PARTE TO CONTINUE PLAINTIFF'S PARTIAL MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND REVIEW NOTICE OF RENEWED MOTION FOR SANCTIONS; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DATES AND DEADLINES; REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER SHORTENING TIME REGARDING FASHION CLICK'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS AND UPDATE CASE CHRONOLOGY REGARDING SAME; PREPARE MEMORANDUM WITH REVISED MOTION DEADLINES.	1.40	266.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND CO-DEFENDANT BRIEFINGS; ADDITIONAL LEGAL RESEARCH OF CASE LAW RAISED IN OPPOSITION BRIEFINGS; PREPARE REPLY BRIEF.	7.00	2,030.00
04/10/2011	SPS	REVIEW AND EDIT DRAFT REPLY BRIEF.	0.80	308.00
04/11/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF WET SEAL'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; REVIEW AND ANALYZE OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, IN PREPARATION OF REPLY; PREPARE CITATIONS TO REPLY BRIEF; REVIEW AND ANALYZE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPTS OF D. JUNG AND J. NAH AND PREPARE CITATIONS TO RELEVANT TESTIMONY.	4.00	760.00
	MAY	RESEARCH REGARDING LOCAL RULES.	0.50	95.00
	ALR	PREPARE REPLY BRIEF.	4.20	1,218.00
	SPS	REVIEW AND REVISE REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	1.00	385.00
04/12/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME.	0.30	57.00
	ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF PLAINTIFF'S REPLY BRIEF AND CO-DEFENDANT REPLY BRIEFS IN SUPPORT OF MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.80	232.00
04/13/2011	BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE AND INDEX SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	1.60	176.00
	ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS;		

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3

04/30/2011

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 51619

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

		PREPARE FOR HEARING ON MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; CORRESPONDENCE WITH CLIENT REGARDING DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS.	1.90	551.00
	SPS	REVIEW AND ANALYZE RULE 16 ISSUES AND PRETRIAL DEADLINES.	0.50	192.50
04/18/2011	ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER OF CONTINUANCE OF HEARINGS ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME; PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING REVISED DATES AND DEADLINES.	0.50	95.00
	ALR	RESEARCH NEW CASE LAW REGARDING STANDING TO CHALLENGE OWNERSHIP OF COPYRIGHTED DESIGNS.	0.20	58.00
04/19/2011	MAY	RESEARCH TRIAL RELATED DEADLINES FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.50	95.00
	ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING PRETRIAL PREPARATION AND FILINGS.	1.30	377.00
	SPS	REVIEW PRETRIAL DEADLINES, REQUIREMENTS AND EVIDENTIARY ISSUES, AND ANALYZE UPCOMING ISSUES AND ITEMS TO DISCUSS WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL.	1.30	500.50
04/20/2011	ANC	REVISE DRAFT JOINT STIPULATION TO CONTINUE TRIAL.	0.40	76.00
	ALR	PRETRIAL PREPARATION, INCLUDING STRATEGY FOR ADMISSION OF KEY WITNESSES AND EXHIBITS AT TRIAL AND OTHER EVIDENTIARY ISSUES; PREPARE STIPULATION TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE AND PROPOSED ORDER.	3.10	899.00
	SPS	PREPARE STIPULATION EXTENDING TRIAL AND RELATED DEADLINES AND CORRESPOND WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL REGARDING SAME.	0.40	154.00
04/21/2011	ANC	ANALYSIS REGARDING REVISED TRIAL DATES AND DEADLINES FOR TRIAL CONTINUANCE AND FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE CONTINUANCE; REVISE STIPULATION AND PREPARE DECLARATION OF S. SHAW IN SUPPORT OF TRIAL CONTINUANCE.	1.40	266.00
	ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING PRETRIAL PREPARATION; PREPARE STIPULATION TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH ALL COUNSEL REGARDING SAME; CORRESPONDENCE WITH CLIENT REGARDING CASE STATUS AND TRIAL.	1.10	319.00
	SPS	CONFER WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL AND FINALIZE STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF TRIAL DATE.	0.30	115.50
04/25/2011	ALR	CORRESPONDENCE WITH ALL COUNSEL REGARDING TRIAL DATES AND RULE 16 CONFERENCE.	0.20	58.00
	ALR	PREPARE STIPULATION TO EXTEND TRIAL DATE FOR FILING.	0.30	87.00
04/28/2011	ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING PRETRIAL PLEADINGS AND DOCUMENTS.	0.20	58.00
04/30/2011	ALR	LOCATE ITALIAN TRANSLATOR TO TRANSLATE ITALIAN COPYRIGHT		

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 4

04/30/2011

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 51619

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES

C&J MATTER WET01-05

ACT FOR PURPOSES OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.

0.20 58.00

CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED

78.40 21,662.50

RECAPITULATION				
<u>TIMEKEEPER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>HOURS</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	13.10	\$385.00	\$5,043.50
AARON RENFRO	ASSOCIATE	43.40	290.00	12,586.00
MARIAM A. YUSUF	PARALEGAL	1.50	190.00	285.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	18.80	190.00	3,572.00
BRITTANY DAVISON	PARALEGAL	1.60	110.00	176.00

03/28/2011	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	48.23
04/05/2011	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	165.75
04/05/2011	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	212.50
04/12/2011	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	27.50
04/25/2011	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	78.75
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	532.73
	TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	22,195.23
	PREVIOUS BALANCE BEFORE ADJUSTMENTS	\$37,711.00
04/30/2011	CREDIT AGAINST MARCH STATEMENT, PER CLIENT REQUEST	-1,500.00
	PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING	\$36,211.00
05/09/2011	PAYMENT BY CHECK # 553607	-37,711.00
	BALANCE DUE	<u>\$20,695.23</u>

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

CALL & JENSEN
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 700
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660
(949) 717-3000

THE WET SEAL, INC.
JULIANNA HALLSTED, ACP
ADVANCED CERTIFIED PARALEGAL
26972 BURBANK
FOOTHILL RANCH CA 92610

PAGE: 1
05/31/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 1

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

DRAFT STATEMENT

05/02/2011

ANC	REVIEW JUDGE WU'S ORDER GRANTING CONTINUANCE OF TRIAL AND RELATED DEADLINES; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR WITH REVISED TRIAL DATES AND DEADLINES AND PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME.	1.30	247.00	328
ALR	INVESTIGATE PROVISIONS OF ITALIAN COPYRIGHT ACT NEEDING CERTIFIED TRANSLATION FOR PURPOSES OF DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS.	0.30	87.00	333
SPS	ANALYZE EVIDENTIARY ISSUES REGARDING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.40	154.00	345

05/03/2011

ALR	PLAN AND PREPARE FOR TRANSLATION OF RELEVANT PORTIONS OF ITALIAN COPYRIGHT ACT; PREPARE NOTICE OF LODGING ITALIAN COPYRIGHT ACT AND CERTIFIED TRANSLATION OF EXCERPTS; RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS OF EUROPEAN AND BERNE CONVENTION RULES OF COPYRIGHT ISSUES, INCLUDING OWNERSHIP, WORK-MADE FOR HIRE, AND OTHER ISSUES RELEVANT TO TRANSFER AND PROTECTION OF COPYRIGHTED WORKS.	1.20	348.00	334
SPS	STRATEGIZE FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT HEARING AND REVIEW TRANSLATION OF EVIDENCE OF ITALIAN LAW.	0.50	192.50	346

05/04/2011

ALR	PREPARE NOTICE OF LODGING OF ITALIAN COPYRIGHT ACT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR FILING; REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF D. JUNG'S ERRATA SHEET AND CORRECTIONS TO DEPOSITION TESTIMONY; REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF RECENT JURY INSTRUCTIONS APPROVED IN CENTRAL DISTRICT RELATING TO COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT CASES IN PREPARATION FOR TRIAL DOCUMENTS.	0.90	261.00	335
SPS	REVISE FILING FOR NOTICE OF ITALIAN LAW IN SUPPORT OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION.	0.30	115.50	347

05/09/2011

ALR	COMMUNICATE WITH CO-DEFENDANTS REGARDING SETTLEMENT ISSUES.	0.10	29.00	336
-----	---	------	-------	-----

05/10/2011

ALR	COMMUNICATE WITH CO-DEFENDANTS REGARDING
-----	--

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 2
05/31/2011
1780-05M
STATEMENT #: 1

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

	SETTLEMENT STATUS.	0.20	58.00	337
SPS	PREPARE FOR HEARING ON SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.30	115.50	348
05/11/2011				
ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING SETTLEMENT ALTERNATIVES; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL.	0.40	116.00	338
SPS	ANALYSIS REGARDING SETTLEMENT OF OTHER PARTIES AND PREPARE FOR HEARING ON SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION.	2.00	770.00	349
05/12/2011				
ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER ON DEFENDANTS' JOINT MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; UPDATE CASE CHRONOLOGY REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00	331
ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYZE TENTATIVE RULING ON MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING RECOVERY OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND OBTAINING JUDGMENT.	1.00	290.00	339
SPS	PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND HEARING ON SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	5.40	2,079.00	350
05/16/2011				
SRP	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION AND COURT'S TENTATIVE ORDER GRANTING CLIENT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE OPPOSITION TO APPLICATION.	4.20	1,218.00	327
ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE JUDGE WU'S TENTATIVE RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; PREPARE CORRESPONDENCE TO CLERK J. GONZALEZ REGARDING STATUS OF FINAL ORDER AND PREPARE MEMORANDUM REGARDING SAME.	0.40	76.00	330
ALR	ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE NEW EVIDENCE.	0.50	145.00	340
SPS	REVIEW STIPULATION WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL AND MEET AND CONFER REGARDING ATTORNEYS' FEE MOTION; REVIEW EX PARTE APPLICATION FROM PLAINTIFF AND ANALYZE ARGUMENTS FOR OPPOSITION; REVIEW DRAFT.	1.90	731.50	351
05/17/2011				
SGB	REVISE OPPOSITION TO EX PARTE MOTION.	1.50	405.00	324
ANC	REVIEW PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE REGARDING EXHIBITS IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED DEADLINES; REVIEW OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE AND UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING SAME.	0.50	95.00	329

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 3

05/31/2011

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 1

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

ALR	PREPARE WET SEAL'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ORDER GRANTING LEAVE FOR MANUAL FILING.	0.70	203.00	341
05/18/2011				
ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE FASHION CLICK'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 1; UPDATE CASE CALENDAR REGARDING RELATED MOTION HEARING DATES; REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE NOS. 1 AND 2 AND FASHION CLICK'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 1, AND UPDATE TRIAL BINDER AND INDEX.	0.60	114.00	332
ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYZE PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS IN LIMINE.	0.30	87.00	342
05/19/2011				
BSD	ANALYZE CASE DOCUMENTS; ORGANIZE AND INDEX SAME FOR ATTORNEYS.	0.60	66.00	326
ALR	ANALYZE LITIGATION STRATEGY FOLLOWING TENTATIVE RULING ON MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT.	0.20	58.00	343
05/31/2011				
ANC	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER PRECLUDING EVIDENCE, ARGUMENT, AND TESTIMONY REGARDING PRIOR LAWSUITS, IN PREPARATION FOR TRIAL.	0.40	76.00	325
ALR	REVIEW AND ANALYZE ORDER REGARDING STIPULATION TO PRECLUDE ALL PARTIES FROM OFFERING EVIDENCE OF PRIOR LAWSUITS; ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY REGARDING PREPARATION OF PRETRIAL DOCUMENTS AND COMMUNICATE WITH CO-DEFENDANTS REGARDING SAME; PREPARE MEMORANDUM OF FACTS AND LAW.	1.00	290.00	344
SPS	ANALYSIS REGARDING PRETRIAL OBLIGATIONS AND FILINGS.	0.80	308.00	355
	CURRENT SERVICES RENDERED	28.30	8,811.00	

RECAPITULATION

TIMEKEEPER	TITLE	HOURS	RATE	TOTAL
SCOTT P. SHAW	SHAREHOLDER	11.60	\$385.00	\$4,466.00
AARON RENFRO	ASSOCIATE	6.80	290.00	1,972.00
SHANEN R. PROUT	ASSOCIATE	4.20	290.00	1,218.00
SAM BROOKS	ASSOCIATE	1.50	270.00	405.00
ANDREA CABRIALES	PARALEGAL	3.60	190.00	684.00
BRITTANY DAVISON	PARALEGAL	0.60	110.00	66.00

PARKING & MILEAGE	58.18
TOTAL EXPENSES	58.18

04/19/2011	ONLINE LEGAL RESEARCH	215.13	33
05/03/2011	TRANSLATION SERVICES OF, ITALIAN COPYRIGHT LAW ARTICLES	215.67	30
05/04/2011	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	48.23	36
05/18/2011	COURIER SERVICES, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	19.95	34
	TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS	498.98	

THE WET SEAL, INC.

PAGE: 4

05/31/2011

1780-05M

STATEMENT #: 1

L.A. PRINTEX V. CSI INDUSTRIES
C&J MATTER WET01-05

TOTAL CURRENT CHARGES	9,368.16	
PRIOR BILLS OUTSTANDING	\$20,695.23	
06/06/2011 PAYMENT BY CHECK # 553814	-20,695.23	15
BALANCE DUE	<u>\$9,368.16</u>	

TIME INDICATED IN HOURS & TENTHS OF HOURS
PAYMENT DUE UPON PRESENTATION
12% INTEREST IF PAYMENT NOT RECEIVED WITHIN 20 DAYS
FEDERAL TAX ID # 33-0120573

EXHIBIT E

SURVEY INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This year's survey contains information from 174 Southern California law firm participants which includes 8,195 attorneys and 8,295 non-attorney staff.

Of the 174 participating firms, 86 of them range from 1 to 25 attorneys, 58 range from 26 to 75 attorneys and 30 firms have 76 or more attorneys. The geographical dispersion of the participating firms is as follows:

- 54 firms from downtown Los Angeles and mid-Wilshire area
- 48 firms from Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood and related areas
- 17 firms from Santa Monica, West Los Angeles, Marina del Rey and related areas
- 12 firms from Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, Universal City, the San Fernando Valley and related areas
- 41 firms from Orange County
- 2 firms from other locations

Base salary and bonus data were collected for 86 full-time and 28 part-time position categories.

SURVEY CONFIDENTIALITY

Numerous security procedures and controls are in place to safeguard and protect the confidentiality of the participating Firms and the reported data.

Your completed survey data was sent directly to RBZ, LLP for tabulation and summarization. All data is sent electronically to a secure site. Only two individuals within our firm have access to this information. All individual firm data is strictly confidential and will not be disclosed or distributed to any party by RBZ, LLP.

SURVEY RESULTS

Survey results are available to both survey participants and non-participants. Non-participants may purchase the survey results from:

RBZ, LLP
Suite 900
11755 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, California 90025

If you have any questions, please contact David Roberts or Catherine Aldrich at 310-478-4148.

EXHIBIT E

SURVEY METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

The codes used in the Survey for **FIRM SIZE** are as follows:

<u>CODE</u>	<u>FIRM SIZE</u>
A	1 to 7 attorneys
B	8 to 15 attorneys
C	16 to 25 attorneys
D	26 to 35 attorneys
E	36 to 50 attorneys
F	51 to 75 attorneys
G	76 to 150 attorneys
H	151 or more attorneys

The codes used in the Survey for **GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION** are as follows:

<u>CODE</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
1	Downtown Los Angeles and mid-Wilshire area
2	Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood and related areas
3	Santa Monica, West Los Angeles, Marina del Rey and related areas
4	Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, Universal City, the San Fernando Valley and related areas
5	Orange County
6	Other locations

Within the compensation categories, the total number of firms by size will equal the All Firms number. In the Location section, the total firms in all locations usually will not equal the All Firms number because each participating firm may have multiple salary locations or branches.

SECTION II – GENERAL QUESTIONS

This section reports the responses on the general questions regarding firm data. Data in this section is reported by the number of firms responding. Since all participants did not respond to each question, the analyses are reported only for those firms responding. Thus, many totals will be less than the total number of firms participating in this year's Survey.

SECTION III – ATTORNEYS – Compensation, Billing Rates, and Billable Hours

This section reports the responses on base salary, bonuses, billing rates and billable hours for partners and associates. The salaries reported were those in effect on July 1, 2010, and bonuses reported were the last bonuses paid prior to July 1, 2010. The categories of the analyses in this section (and also in Sections IV through VI), are as follows:

Average – The total of all base salaries/bonuses/total compensation reported divided by the number of base salaries/bonuses/total compensation reported.

10th Percentile – The value that has 10% of the reported base salaries/bonuses/total compensation values below it.

25th Percentile – The value that has 25% of the reported base salaries/bonuses/total compensation values below it.

Median – The value where there is an equal number of reported base salaries/bonuses/total compensation both above and below the value.

75th Percentile – The value that has 75% of the reported base salaries/bonuses/total compensation values below it.

90th Percentile – The value that has 90% of the reported base salaries/bonuses/total compensation values below it.

For certain position categories, a small number of incumbents and corresponding salary data were reported for various firm sizes or locations. In order to maintain the confidentiality of individual data, certain statistical information was omitted based upon the number of incumbents reported. The omitted information is noted by an asterisk (*) in the statistical data.

SECTION IV – DIRECT NON-ATTORNEY BILLER COMPENSATION

This section reports the responses on base salary and bonuses (plus billable hours for legal assistants) for the 16 full-time non-attorney billable positions covered by the Survey. The salaries reported were those in effect on July 1, 2010, and bonuses reported were the last bonuses paid prior to July 1, 2010. The categories of the analyses in this section are the same as described above for attorneys.

SECTION V – DIRECT COMPENSATION – STAFF

This section reports the responses on base salary and bonuses for the 66 full-time non-billable staff positions covered by the Survey. The salaries reported were those in effect on July 1, 2010, and bonuses reported were the last bonuses paid prior to July 1, 2010. The categories of the analyses in this section are the same as described above for attorneys.

SECTION VI – PART-TIME STAFF

This section reports the responses on base salary (hourly compensation) and billing rate (if applicable) for the 28 part-time staff positions covered by the Survey. The salaries reported were those in effect on July 1, 2010, and bonuses reported were the last bonuses paid prior to July 1, 2010.

RBZ 2010 Southern California Law Firm Compensation, Billing Rate and Benefits Survey**1 - Equity Partners/Shareholders****Billing Rates**

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
All Firms	115	1,038	501	274	395	495	605	735
Size A	12	29	397	185	350	395	520	562
Size B	34	144	435	285	348	413	515	600
Size C	22	132	462	300	385	460	525	623
Size D	15	151	489	310	423	490	593	665
Size E	17	249	482	230	395	485	570	698
Size F	4	45	525	225	385	495	745	806
Size G	9	206	508	275	406	525	620	700
Size H	2	82	769	670	715	755	835	875
Location 1	32	376	499	293	395	480	576	765
Location 2	30	259	594	425	500	595	708	750
Location 3	11	113	487	231	425	500	595	645
Location 4	12	79	451	285	390	460	538	595
Location 5	28	201	420	190	300	415	495	670
Location 6	2	10	385	348	356	395	399	422
Headquarters office	94	847	471	241	385	470	565	680
Branch office	21	191	635	470	550	650	728	785

1 - Equity Partners/Shareholders**Billable Hours**

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
All Firms	107	982	1,661	1,051	1,372	1,666	1,942	2,198
Size A	12	29	1,722	1,146	1,404	1,592	2,011	2,415
Size B	31	116	1,632	1,043	1,334	1,644	1,894	2,178
Size C	20	126	1,593	975	1,287	1,578	1,928	2,198
Size D	14	140	1,664	1,025	1,329	1,664	1,947	2,237
Size E	16	230	1,613	1,095	1,360	1,614	1,855	2,115
Size F	4	44	1,701	1,229	1,500	1,695	1,981	2,077
Size G	8	218	1,750	1,156	1,512	1,779	2,012	2,220
Size H	2	79	1,654	956	1,361	1,763	1,992	2,196
Location 1	30	363	1,703	1,081	1,407	1,690	1,981	2,247
Location 2	26	233	1,573	945	1,302	1,616	1,861	2,115
Location 3	11	110	1,601	1,093	1,322	1,618	1,832	2,067
Location 4	12	77	1,696	1,240	1,441	1,605	1,873	2,252
Location 5	26	189	1,709	1,085	1,375	1,740	2,027	2,307
Location 6	2	10	1,654	1,122	1,619	1,759	1,849	1,915
Headquarters office	89	828	1,666	1,050	1,378	1,668	1,940	2,207
Branch office	18	154	1,632	1,064	1,342	1,629	1,947	2,144

RBZ 2010 Southern California Law Firm Compensation, Billing Rate and Benefits Survey

1 - Equity Partners/Shareholders**Billing rates by class year**

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
2004 and Later	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
2003	2	2	310	*	*	*	*	*
2002	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
2001	5	5	409	309	375	385	495	513
2000	5	10	489	385	385	415	511	756
1999	12	16	407	243	315	408	469	538
1998	15	19	431	256	348	450	510	534
1997	12	20	456	350	400	443	521	541
1996	22	31	502	360	413	485	550	755
1995	17	22	484	199	285	513	598	825
1994	18	26	420	183	281	468	508	668
1993	23	30	481	248	350	450	598	712
1992	28	36	466	285	371	450	565	613
1991	29	39	523	342	475	525	633	725
1990	22	29	513	307	395	525	600	717
1989	24	30	508	217	378	500	670	772
1988	26	37	461	216	350	450	595	682
1987	24	29	484	199	395	500	595	707
1986	23	31	487	193	395	495	608	745
1985	27	34	495	257	414	528	575	650
1984	26	32	545	353	395	515	684	823
Before 1984 or Unspecified	103	557	518	325	415	500	625	735

1 - Equity Partners/Shareholders**Billing rates by practice area**

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
No type over 70%	2	2	560	*	*	*	*	*
Bankruptcy Law	13	28	541	425	494	535	601	633
Corp/Tax/RE	51	214	572	410	451	538	699	792
Entertainment	6	16	575	505	515	550	606	675
Environmental	4	4	580	481	*	*	*	*
Family Law	6	13	575	500	500	600	625	625
General Business	10	26	345	280	285	293	389	483
Insurance Defense	15	32	234	150	154	175	194	325
Labor/Employment	26	78	509	350	420	475	570	755
Litigation	81	404	487	300	385	475	595	715
Municipal	3	17	208	172	186	193	230	268
Patent/Intel Prop	17	54	527	407	435	505	594	677
Plaintiff	1	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Trust, Estate & Probate	17	36	497	390	419	488	551	625
Workers Comp	2	3	170	*	*	*	*	*
Other	16	109	535	250	400	565	670	753

Note: The number of firms may exceed the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one practice area.

RBZ 2010 Southern California Law Firm Compensation, Billing Rate and Benefits Survey

3 - Associates**Billing rates**

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
All Firms	130	1,812	321	171	225	310	400	480
Size A	10	38	264	165	185	265	325	392
Size B	33	158	310	166	250	310	360	431
Size C	26	210	285	155	200	295	350	400
Size D	18	209	319	188	240	295	400	467
Size E	18	307	295	150	180	278	373	482
Size F	9	166	319	175	253	310	375	455
Size G	12	451	325	175	250	320	410	475
Size H	4	273	386	180	250	395	485	605
Location 1	37	738	331	175	220	318	415	495
Location 2	34	373	377	275	310	360	450	500
Location 3	14	165	282	150	180	290	360	410
Location 4	12	107	284	150	155	285	335	400
Location 5	32	423	278	165	190	260	325	420
Location 6	1	6	*	*	*	*	*	*
Headquarters office	97	1,385	299	160	195	290	375	450
Branch office	33	427	390	273	315	380	465	522

3 - Associates**Billing rates by practice area**

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
No type over 70%	4	9	358	253	300	385	420	462
Bankruptcy Law	14	32	355	250	298	363	395	458
Corp/Tax/RE	50	257	396	260	310	395	475	544
Entertainment	8	23	350	275	288	330	410	450
Environmental	6	8	406	333	355	380	449	508
Family Law	6	22	334	254	318	330	371	399
General Business	13	40	262	180	198	255	285	352
Insurance Defense	15	142	170	146	150	155	172	225
Labor/Employment	26	118	348	180	245	328	425	573
Litigation	99	773	330	186	255	320	400	470
Municipal	5	35	229	184	192	200	248	334
Patent/Intel Prop	17	62	356	235	285	348	410	510
Plaintiff	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Trust, Estate & Probate	17	49	329	190	275	325	375	500
Workers Comp	5	34	175	138	150	155	180	220
Other	22	185	296	175	180	275	370	455

Note: The number of firms may exceed the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one practice area.

RBZ 2010 Southern California Law Firm Compensation, Billing Rate and Benefits Survey

12 - Legal Assistant - (Non Exempt) - Super Senior - 20+ Years

Billing Rates

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
All Firms	68	174	206	122	175	210	235	280
Size A	4	6	181	125	143	195	214	223
Size B	8	9	178	119	125	165	220	237
Size C	14	24	186	138	155	193	200	230
Size D	8	15	163	120	155	175	188	190
Size E	10	26	229	175	180	225	284	303
Size F	8	29	231	200	210	230	240	264
Size G	11	47	209	109	178	215	235	281
Size H	5	18	206	95	198	230	244	265
Location 1	20	57	184	95	155	195	225	250
Location 2	17	42	247	197	225	240	280	305
Location 3	8	23	213	186	195	215	223	284
Location 4	4	7	211	186	210	220	223	227
Location 5	18	43	193	127	153	190	225	243
Location 6	1	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Litigation	45	79	192	124	170	195	220	241
Transactional	23	38	226	152	211	230	254	280
Insurance Defense-Litigation	4	4	145	81	*	103	*	243
Intellectual Property	7	9	184	92	185	200	235	235
Other	19	37	221	130	180	215	285	320
Did not specify practice area	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Headquarters office	50	126	197	113	158	203	230	263
Branch office	18	48	229	175	194	233	250	295

Note on Location: The number of firms may not equal the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one location.

Note on Practice Area: The number of firms may not equal the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one practice area.

<u>Code</u>	<u>Firm Size</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Location</u>
A	1 - 7 attorneys	1	Downtown, Los Angeles and mid-Wilshire area
B	8 - 15 attorneys	2	Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood and related areas
C	16 - 25 attorneys	3	Santa Monica, West Los Angeles, Marina del Rey and related areas
D	26 - 35 attorneys	4	Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, Universal City, San Fernando Valley and related areas
E	36 - 50 attorneys		
F	51 - 75 attorneys	5	Orange County
G	76 - 150 attorneys	6	Other locations
H	151 or more attorneys		

RBZ 2010 Southern California Law Firm Compensation, Billing Rate and Benefits Survey

13 - Legal Assistant - (Non Exempt) - Senior - 11 to 20 Years**Billing Rates**

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
All Firms	70	219	196	104	150	195	235	275
Size A	4	7	146	95	123	150	165	181
Size B	8	12	177	141	150	165	203	225
Size C	12	20	172	115	150	178	190	220
Size D	9	20	183	140	163	185	206	221
Size E	11	23	198	105	158	195	253	281
Size F	7	22	219	150	188	213	255	294
Size G	14	69	206	120	150	215	260	285
Size H	5	46	195	95	176	200	235	278
Location 1	27	110	183	95	140	188	225	270
Location 2	16	42	243	185	209	240	280	300
Location 3	8	22	207	166	185	213	231	250
Location 4	3	6	193	165	173	195	214	220
Location 5	16	39	175	105	145	150	210	235
Location 6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Litigation	52	122	191	125	150	190	225	265
Transactional	12	18	225	181	200	215	248	284
Insurance Defense-Litigation	3	5	93	89	95	95	95	95
Intellectual Property	10	20	228	173	219	235	241	275
Other	21	54	193	95	143	190	255	285
Did not specify practice area	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Headquarters office	46	147	179	95	150	185	215	246
Branch office	24	72	229	152	190	238	266	285

Note on Location: The number of firms may not equal the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one location.

Note on Practice Area: The number of firms may not equal the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one practice area.

<u>Code</u>	<u>Firm Size</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Location</u>
A	1 - 7 attorneys	1	Downtown, Los Angeles and mid-Wilshire area
B	8 - 15 attorneys	2	Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood and related areas
C	16 - 25 attorneys	3	Santa Monica, West Los Angeles, Marina del Rey and related areas
D	26 - 35 attorneys	4	Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, Universal City, San Fernando Valley and related areas
E	36 - 50 attorneys		
F	51 - 75 attorneys	5	Orange County
G	76 - 150 attorneys	6	Other locations
H	151 or more attorneys		

RBZ 2010 Southern California Law Firm Compensation, Billing Rate and Benefits Survey

14 - Legal Assistant - (Non Exempt) - Mid Level - 6 to 10 Years

Billing Rates

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
All Firms	57	140	180	100	145	190	220	236
Size A	2	2	203	*	*	*	*	*
Size B	8	16	160	93	136	153	213	220
Size C	7	8	183	168	179	188	190	193
Size D	8	13	176	143	170	170	190	217
Size E	10	16	162	85	96	180	199	235
Size F	5	8	217	181	208	220	240	257
Size G	13	46	189	108	165	200	224	238
Size H	4	31	177	95	135	165	228	240
Location 1	18	58	169	99	135	168	205	230
Location 2	14	31	204	150	170	210	230	260
Location 3	7	18	213	179	196	218	234	242
Location 4	3	4	150	110	*	145	*	194
Location 5	14	28	161	85	99	170	210	225
Location 6	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Litigation	39	74	175	100	145	178	220	235
Transactional	11	12	180	116	178	190	205	210
Insurance Defense-Litigation	4	5	109	75	75	95	100	160
Intellectual Property	9	16	205	160	200	215	231	235
Other	14	33	190	100	150	195	230	250
Did not specify practice area	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Headquarters office	35	84	162	95	131	155	200	231
Branch office	22	56	207	165	190	213	230	243

Note on Location: The number of firms may not equal the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one location.

Note on Practice Area: The number of firms may not equal the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one practice area.

<u>Code</u>	<u>Firm Size</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Location</u>
A	1 - 7 attorneys	1	Downtown, Los Angeles and mid-Wilshire area
B	8 - 15 attorneys	2	Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood and related areas
C	16 - 25 attorneys	3	Santa Monica, West Los Angeles, Marina del Rey and related areas
D	26 - 35 attorneys	4	Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, Universal City, San Fernando Valley and related areas
E	36 - 50 attorneys		
F	51 - 75 attorneys	5	Orange County
G	76 - 150 attorneys	6	Other locations
H	151 or more attorneys		

RBZ 2010 Southern California Law Firm Compensation, Billing Rate and Benefits Survey

15 - Legal Assistant - (Non Exempt) - Junior - 2 to 5 Years**Billing Rates**

	<u>Firms</u>	<u>Incumbents</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>10th Percentile</u>	<u>25th Percentile</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>75th Percentile</u>	<u>90th Percentile</u>
All Firms	37	68	162	97	119	150	200	232
Size A	2	2	133	*	*	*	*	*
Size B	6	9	149	112	125	150	185	196
Size C	4	5	151	95	95	135	160	226
Size D	3	4	134	103	*	125	*	172
Size E	4	8	146	85	85	165	181	202
Size F	3	3	207	*	*	235	*	*
Size G	11	20	187	115	179	195	206	212
Size H	4	17	154	104	110	135	145	256
Location 1	11	27	169	106	135	190	203	218
Location 2	12	22	183	111	124	185	216	269
Location 3	4	4	180	165	*	178	*	198
Location 4	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Location 5	9	13	112	85	95	100	130	147
Location 6	1	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Litigation	20	34	154	95	118	143	199	209
Transactional	9	9	201	123	175	195	240	262
Insurance Defense-Litigation	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Intellectual Property	3	3	182	*	*	180	*	*
Other	10	21	159	100	110	135	185	280
Did not specify practice area	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Headquarters office	24	44	146	95	110	135	175	216
Branch office	13	24	191	123	175	198	210	251

Note on Location: The number of firms may not equal the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one location.

Note on Practice Area: The number of firms may not equal the total number of firms participating as various firms may be represented in more than one practice area.

<u>Code</u>	<u>Firm Size</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Location</u>
A	1 - 7 attorneys	1	Downtown, Los Angeles and mid-Wilshire area
B	8 - 15 attorneys	2	Beverly Hills, Century City, Westwood and related areas
C	16 - 25 attorneys	3	Santa Monica, West Los Angeles, Marina del Rey and related areas
D	26 - 35 attorneys	4	Pasadena, Glendale, Burbank, Universal City, San Fernando Valley and related areas
E	36 - 50 attorneys	5	Orange County
F	51 - 75 attorneys	6	Other locations
G	76 - 150 attorneys		
H	151 or more attorneys		

EXHIBIT F

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PRIORITY SEND

CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL

Case No. **CV 09-2449-JFW (FMOx)**

Date: July 2, 2010

Title: L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. -v- William Carter Co., et al.

PRESENT:

HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**Shannon Reilly
Courtroom Deputy**

**None Present
Court Reporter**

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:
None

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:
None

PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS):

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT OF DEFENDANTS MS. BUBBLES, INC.
AND AEROPOSTALE, INC. [filed 5/24/10; Docket No.
72]; and**

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY ADJUDICATION PURSUANT TO FED. R.
CIV. P. 56 [filed 5/24/10; Docket No. 75]**

On May 24, 2010, Defendants Ms. Bubbles, Inc. ("Ms. Bubbles") and Aeropostale, Inc. ("Aeropostale") (collectively, "Defendants") filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On May 28, 2010, Plaintiff L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. ("Plaintiff") filed its Opposition. On June 7, 2010, Defendants filed a Reply. On May 24, 2010, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Summary Adjudication Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 ("Motion for Summary Adjudication"). On May 28, 2010, Defendants filed their Opposition. On June 7, 2010, Plaintiff filed a Reply.

Pursuant to Rule 78 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 7-15, the Court found these matters appropriate for submission on the papers without oral argument. The matters were, therefore, removed from the Court's June 20, 2010, hearing calendar and the parties were given advance notice. After considering the moving, opposing, and reply papers, and the arguments therein, the Court rules as follows:

I. Factual and Procedural Background¹

¹ To the extent any of these facts are disputed, they are not material to the disposition of the motions before the Court. In addition, to the extent that the Court has relied on evidence to

A. The Parties

Plaintiff is a Los Angeles-based printing mill, which prints two dimensional patterns on fabric for use in the apparel industry. The designs for the patterns are created by Plaintiff's in-house design team, and Plaintiff markets those designs to the apparel industry. Defendant Ms. Bubbles is a Los Angeles-based wholesaler of women and men's apparel, and has been in the fashion industry for approximately 17 years. Defendant Aeropostale is a mall-based, specialty retailer of causal apparel and accessories, principally targeting 14- to 17-year-old women and men.

According to Plaintiff, a women's shirt containing a floral pattern design that was manufactured by Defendant Ms. Bubbles and sold by Defendant Aeropostale under its own brand infringes the copyright that Plaintiff holds for a fabric design pattern, which is identified by Plaintiff's internal designation as Design Number C30020. This design was part of a group of designs that was registered with the United States Copyright Office ("Copyright Office") under the name "Small Flower Group A."

B. Plaintiff's Amendment of its Copyright for Small Flower Group A.

On July 17, 2002, Plaintiff received a Certification of Registration (U.S. Copyright No. VAu 557-306) from the Copyright Office for a textile design collection entitled Small Flower Group A.² Plaintiff's registration listed a group of five unpublished designs, including Design Number C30020, which is the floral pattern that Plaintiff contends has been infringed by Defendants.

After Plaintiff discovered, contrary to the representation in its application for the copyright, that two of the designs registered as part of Small Flower Group A may have been published, Plaintiff filed a Form CA Supplemental Registration on February 22, 2010, which attempted to change or amend the registration for Small Flower Group A from an unpublished collection to one published on April 1, 2002.³ When Plaintiff learned that the regulations prohibited the filing of both published and unpublished works on a single registration, it withdrew the amendment and filed a second Form CA Supplemental Registration on May 13, 2010. The second Form CA Supplemental Registration amended the registration by deleting the two designs (Design Numbers R1154 and C30011) that may have been published prior to the original registration in July 2002. The amendment did not request any change or otherwise affect the remaining three unpublished works, including Design Number C30020. Finally, on May 13, 2010, in an apparent effort to foreclose any further questions regarding the validity of its copyright, Plaintiff filed an individual registration with the Copyright Office for its Design Number C30020 on fabric, and the registration

which the parties have objected, the Court has considered and overruled those objections. As to the remaining objections, the Court finds that it is unnecessary to rule on those objections because the disputed evidence was not relied on by the Court.

² In the case of unpublished works, the Copyright Office permits the registration of multiple works on a single application so long as *all* of the works in the registration are unpublished works. 37 C.F.R. 202.3(b)(4)(i)(B).

³ Design Number C30020 is not one of the designs that was published prior to registration of the collective work.

was approved by the Copyright Office.

II. Legal Standard

Summary judgment is proper where “the pleadings, the discovery and disclosure materials on file, and any affidavits show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). The moving party has the burden of demonstrating the absence of a genuine issue of fact for trial. See *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 256 (1986). A party opposing a properly made and supported motion for summary judgment may not rest upon mere denials but must “set out specific facts showing a genuine issue for trial.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e); see also *Taylor v. List*, 880 F.2d 1040, 1045 (9th Cir. 1989) (“A summary judgment motion cannot be defeated by relying solely on conclusory allegations unsupported by factual data.”). In particular, when the non-moving party bears the burden of proving an element essential to its case, that party must make a showing sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact with respect to the existence of that element or be subject to summary judgment. See *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). “An issue of fact is not enough to defeat summary judgment; there must be a genuine issue of material fact, a dispute capable of affecting the outcome of the case.” *American International Group, Inc. v. American International Bank*, 926 F.2d 829, 833 (9th Cir. 1991) (Kozinski, dissenting).

An issue is genuine if evidence is produced that would allow a rational trier of fact to reach a verdict in favor of the non-moving party. *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 248. “This requires evidence, not speculation.” *Meade v. Cedarapids, Inc.*, 164 F.3d 1218, 1225 (9th Cir. 1999). The Court must assume the truth of direct evidence set forth by the opposing party. See *Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.*, 976 F.2d 497, 507 (9th Cir. 1992). However, where circumstantial evidence is presented, the Court may consider the plausibility and reasonableness of inferences arising therefrom. See *Anderson*, 477 U.S. at 249-50; *TW Elec. Serv., Inc. v. Pacific Elec. Contractors Ass’n*, 809 F.2d 626, 631-32 (9th Cir. 1987). Although the party opposing summary judgment is entitled to the benefit of all reasonable inferences, “inferences cannot be drawn from thin air; they must be based on evidence which, if believed, would be sufficient to support a judgment for the nonmoving party.” *American International Group*, 926 F.2d at 836-37. In that regard, “a mere ‘scintilla’ of evidence will not be sufficient to defeat a properly supported motion for summary judgment; rather, the nonmoving party must introduce some ‘significant probative evidence tending to support the complaint.’” *Summers v. Teichert & Son, Inc.*, 127 F.3d 1150, 1152 (9th Cir. 1997).

III. Discussion

On April 8, 2009, Plaintiff filed its Complaint against Defendants, alleging claims for relief for: (1) Copyright Infringement; and (2) Vicarious and/or Contributory Copyright Infringement.⁴ Defendants now move for summary judgment on both claims alleged in Plaintiff’s Complaint on the

⁴ Although Plaintiff’s Complaint names several other defendants, including William Carter Co., Meijer, Inc., JC Penney Corporation, Inc., Carson Pirie Scott & Co., Macy’s, Inc., Kohls Corporation, Sears Holding Corporation, Burlington Coat Factory Direct Corp., Carter’s, Inc., Toys “R” Us, Inc., Winmark Corporation, and Hammond Garment Manufacturing Co., Inc., Defendant Ms. Bubbles and Defendant Aeropostale are the sole remaining defendants in this action.

grounds that: (1) Plaintiff cannot maintain either its first or second claim for relief because its Copyright Registration VAu 557-306 for Small Flower Group A, which includes Design Number C30020, is not valid; (2) Plaintiff cannot maintain either its first or second claim for relief because there is no substantial similarity between Defendants' allegedly infringing garment and Plaintiff's Design Number C30020; and (3) Plaintiff cannot maintain either its first or second claim for relief because there is no evidence that Defendants had access to Plaintiff's Design Number C30020. Plaintiffs have moved for partial summary judgment, requesting the Court to determine as a matter of law the following issues: (1) that Plaintiff's Design Number C30020 is an original work of authorship owned by Plaintiff; and (2) that Defendants copied Plaintiff's original artwork by selling fabric and garments bearing a near-identical copy of Design Number C30020 without Plaintiff's permission.

A. Standard for Proving Copyright Infringement

To prove copyright infringement, Plaintiffs must prove: (1) ownership of a valid copyright in Design Number C30020⁵, and (2) that Defendants copied elements of Design Number C30020 protected by that copyright. See, e.g., *Pasillas v. McDonald's Corp.*, 927 F.2d 440, 442 (9th Cir. 1991); *Three Boys Music Corp. v. Bolton*, 212 F.3d 477, 481 (9th Cir. 2000). Since direct evidence of copying is rarely available and copying can therefore be difficult to prove, Plaintiff "may establish copying by showing (1) circumstantial evidence of access to the protected work and (2) substantial similarity of 'ideas' and 'expression' between the copyrighted work and the allegedly infringing work." *Jason v. Fonda*, 526 F. Supp. 774, 776 (C.D. Cal. 1981), *aff'd*, 698 F.2d 966 (9th Cir. 1982); see also *Three Boys Music*, 212 F.3d at 481 ("Absent direct evidence of copying, proof of infringement involves fact-based showings that the defendant had 'access' to the plaintiff's work and that the two works are 'substantially similar.'").

B. Application of the Copyright Infringement Standard to this Case.

1. There Is No Genuine Issue Of Material Fact With Respect To Access.

"Proof of access requires 'an opportunity to view or to copy plaintiff's work.'" *Three Boys Music Corp. v. Bolton*, 212 F.3d 477, 482 (9th Cir. 2000) quoting *Sid & Marty Krofft*, 562 F.2d at 1172. "Opportunity" has been defined as a "reasonable" possibility that Defendants viewed Plaintiff's Design Number C30020. *Jason*, 526 F. Supp. at 776-77. "[A] bare possibility is insufficient to create a genuine issue of whether" Defendants copied Plaintiff's Design Number C30020. *Id.* at 777.

⁵ Defendants contest that Plaintiff owns a valid copyright in Design Number C30020. However, in this case, because the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that Defendants had access to Plaintiff's Design Number C30020 and there is a lack of substantial similarity between Design Number C30020 and the allegedly infringing garment, and, thus, cannot prevail on its claims for copyright infringement, the Court need not address the issues surrounding the validity of Plaintiff's copyright in Design Number C30020. Instead, for purposes of deciding these motions for summary judgment only, the Court assumed that Plaintiff does have a valid copyright in Design Number C30020.

Because Plaintiff has not been able to produce any direct evidence that Defendants had access to Design Number C30020 when they created the allegedly infringing garment, Plaintiff must rely on circumstantial evidence. "Circumstantial evidence of reasonable access is proven in one of two ways: (1) a particular chain of events is established between the plaintiff's work and the defendant's access to that work (such as through deals with a publisher or record company), or (2) the plaintiff's work has been widely disseminated." *Three Boys Music*, 212 F.3d at 482. Plaintiff does not present any evidence that Defendants had access to Design Number C30020 through any particular chain of events, but instead seeks to prove reasonable access by demonstrating that Design Number C30020 has been widely disseminated. *Three Boys Music*, 212 F.3d at 482.

Plaintiff has failed to raise any genuine issue of material fact with respect to whether Defendants had access to Design Number C30020 through wide dissemination. In *Three Boys*, the Ninth Circuit found that substantial evidence supported a jury's finding of access where the copyrighted song enjoyed significant radio airplay over 20 years. *Three Boys*, 212 F.3d at 483-85. However, in *Art Attack Ink, LLC v. MGA Entertainment, Inc.*, 581 F.3d 1138, 1144 (9th Cir. 2009), the Ninth Circuit found that no widespread dissemination existed, despite the fact that the tee-shirt design at issue in the case was available at a display booth, on individuals wearing the tee-shirt, and via the internet. Similarly, in *Rice v. Fox Broadcasting Co.*, 330 F.3d 1170, 1178 (9th Cir. 2003), the Ninth Circuit found there was no evidence of widespread dissemination of a video even though 19,000 copies were sold over a 13-year period.

In this case, the only evidence of the widespread dissemination of Design Number C30020 submitted by Plaintiff is the Declaration of Jae Nah. In his declaration, Mr. Nah merely states that Plaintiff's first sales of Design Number C30020 were in October 2002, and "that my company produced and sold thousands of yards of fabric bearing [Design Number C30020] to numerous customers from 2002-2008." Declaration of Jae Nah, ¶ 7. However, such vague and conclusory statements certainly create no more than a "bare possibility" that Defendants may have had access to Plaintiff's Design Number C30020. *Jason*, 526 F.Supp. at 776-77. "In and of itself, such a bare possibility is insufficient to create a genuine issue of whether" Defendants had access to Plaintiff's Design Number C30020. *Id.*

2. There is a Lack of Substantial Similarity Between Plaintiff's Design Number C30020 and Defendants' Allegedly Infringing Garment.

Even if the Court were to find that Defendants had access to Plaintiff's work, to prove copying Plaintiff must also "demonstrate that there is a substantial similarity, both of ideas and of the expression of ideas, between the copyrighted work and the allegedly infringing work." *Jason*, 526 F. Supp. at 777. "'Substantial similarity' refers to similarity of expression, not merely similarity of ideas or concepts." *Dr. Seuss Enterprises, L.P. v. Penguin Books USA, Inc.*, 109 F.3d 1394, 1398 (9th Cir. 1997). Only protected expression is relevant for purposes of assessing substantial similarity. See *Shaw v. Lindheim*, 919 F.2d 1353, 1361 (9th Cir. 1990); see also *Smart Inventions, Inc. v. Allied Communications Corp.*, 94 F. Supp. 2d 1060, 1066 (C.D. Cal. 2000) ("It is an axiom of copyright law that ideas are not protected."). "[T]he party claiming infringement may place 'no reliance upon any similarity in expression resulting from' unprotectable elements." *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 35 F.3d 1435, 1446 (9th Cir. 1994) (quoting *Aliotti v. R. Dakin & Co.*, 831 F.2d 898, 901 (9th Cir. 1987)) (emphasis in original).

To determine whether two works are substantially similar, the Ninth Circuit employs a two-part analysis - an extrinsic and an intrinsic test.⁶ “The ‘extrinsic test’ is an objective comparison of specific expressive elements” which “‘focuses on articulable similarities’” between the two works. *Cavalier v. Random House, Inc.*, 297 F.3d 815, 822 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Kouf v. Walt Disney Pictures & Television*, 16 F.3d 1042, 1045 (9th Cir. 1994)). “The intrinsic test is a subjective test that focuses on whether the ordinary, reasonable audience would recognize the [Defendants’] work as a dramatization or picturization of the [P]laintiff’s work.” *Kouf*, 16 F.3d at 1045 (internal quotations omitted). “For summary judgment, only the extrinsic test is important.” *Id.* “[A] plaintiff who cannot satisfy the extrinsic test necessarily loses on summary judgment, because a jury may not find substantial similarity without evidence on both the extrinsic and intrinsic tests.” *Id.*

The Court recognizes that summary judgment is not favored on questions of substantial similarity in copyright cases. See, e.g., *Shaw*, 919 F.2d at 1355. Summary judgment is only appropriate if “no reasonable juror could find substantial similarity of ideas and expression, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.” *Kouf*, 16 F.3d at 1045; see also *Pasillas*, 927 F.2d at 442 (“Our circuit has expressed a certain disfavor for summary judgment on questions of substantial similarity, but it is nevertheless appropriate to grant summary judgment if, considering the evidence and drawing all inferences from it in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, no reasonable jury could find that the works are substantially similar in idea and expression.”). Although summary judgment is generally disfavored on the question of substantial similarity, “summary judgment is proper when the Court determines that the similarity between works is insubstantial as a matter of law.” *Jason*, 526 F. Supp. at 777. Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has “frequently . . . affirmed summary judgment in favor of copyright defendants on the issue of substantial similarity.” *Narell v. Freeman*, 872 F.2d 907, 910 (9th Cir. 1989).

After comparing the sample of Design Number C30020 submitted to the Copyright Office and Defendants’ allegedly infringing garment, and upon review of the admissible evidence and the papers submitted by the parties, the Court concludes that, viewing the evidence in a light most favorable to Plaintiff, no reasonable juror could find that the two works are substantially similar. “The observable similarities between the two designs are of a surface nature only,” namely that both designs represent small-scale overall floral patterns of approximately the same size. *Prestige Fabrics, Inc., v. Universal Manufacturing Corp.*, 304 F.Supp. 903, 905 (S.D.N.Y. 1969). In this case, there are several critical differences between the two patterns. For example, it is undisputed that the flowers, stems, and leaves on Design Number C30020 are far more detailed than those found on the allegedly infringing garment, which have softer edges and are more impressionistic in

⁶ “[O]riginally . . . the extrinsic prong was a test of similarity of ideas based on external criteria; analytic dissection and expert testimony could be used, if helpful. The intrinsic prong was a test for similarity of expression from the standpoint of the ordinary reasonable observer, with no expert assistance. As it has evolved, however, the extrinsic test now objectively considers whether there are substantial similarities in *both* ideas and expression, whereas the intrinsic test continues to measure expression subjectively.” *Apple Computer*, 35 F.3d at 1442. “Because the criteria incorporated into the extrinsic test encompasses all objective manifestations of creativity, the two tests are more sensibly described as objective and subjective analyses of expression, having strayed from *Krofft*’s division between expression and ideas.” *Shaw*, 919 F.2d at 1357.

appearance.⁷ On Design Number C30020, multiple shades of one color are used to give the flowers their definition and sharper edges, while multiple shades of green are used to give the leaves and stems their definition and clean lines. On Defendants' allegedly infringing garment, the flowers are of one uniform color, with the leaves and stem a single shade of green. In the "well-traveled terrain" of floral patterns⁸, these sorts of modest distinctions are sufficient to avoid a finding of substantial similarity. *Textile Corp. v. Citation Fabrics Corp.*, 328 F.Supp. 554, 555-56 (S.D.N.Y. 1971) (denying preliminary injunction in case involving allegedly infringing fabric containing a few minor variations on a design of flowers, birds, and bees); see also *Slifka v. Citation Fabrics Corp.*, 329 F.Supp. 1392, 1393 (S.D.N.Y. 1971) (denying preliminary injunction in case where both fabric designs contained large diamond shapes on an overall paisley pattern and finding that "both parties have worked in a heavily traveled terrain where comparatively modest distinctions may be sufficient to avoid charges of infringement"); *Folio Impressions, Inc. v. Byer California*, 752 F.Supp. 583, 591-92 (S.D.N.Y. 1990) (finding that plaintiff had failed to sustain burden of proving infringement and entering judgment for defendant where plaintiff's rose design had "sharper edges, a three pronged stem, and present[ed] a much more geometrically stylized appearance" while the defendant's rose design had "a single stem, [was] softer looking and the lines [were] more painterly and well rounded.").

In addition, Plaintiff's Design Number C30020 contains an overall background pattern of almost lace-like flowers that is completely lacking in the design on Defendants' allegedly infringing garment. See *Prestige Fabrics*, 304 F.Supp. at 905 (denying motion for preliminary injunction because two flower-patterned fabrics at issue were not substantially similar where, in part, "[t]he defendants' design has a definite and large background whereas the background in the plaintiff's is much less noticeable."). Moreover, the groupings of flowers, stems, and leaves within a vertical row in Design Number C30020 are spaced much farther apart than those on Defendants' allegedly infringing garment. See *Beeba's Creations, Inc. v. Details Sportswear, Inc.*, 1994 WL 268241, *2 (S.D.N.Y. June 15, 1994) (denying preliminary injunction because heart designs at issue were not substantially similar where, in part, the repetition of the pattern within the vertical row was different). Based on the aforementioned differences, the Court concludes that, viewing the evidence in a light most favorable to Plaintiff, no reasonable juror could find that there is a substantial similarity between Plaintiff's Design Number C30020 and Defendants' allegedly infringing garment. See *Manes Fabrics Co. v. Miss Celebrity, Inc.*, 246 F.Supp. 975, 977 (S.D.N.Y. 1965) (finding two floral designs not substantially similar where both designs consisted of floral bouquets set against a striped background, but where defendant used darker shades of green and brown and lighter shades of yellow in its flowers; the green stripe in defendant's fabric was considerably brighter; the composition of the flowers were dissimilar; and fine black lines around the edges of the flowers, leaves, and stems in defendant's design was missing from plaintiff's

⁷ Plaintiff argues this difference is due to Defendants' garment being a "shoddy knock-off" but offers no evidence to support this contention.

⁸ That floral patterns are a "well-traveled terrain" is supported not only by the case law, but also by even a casual inspection of *The Album of Chinese Textile Patterns*, which demonstrates that a multitude of floral-patterned fabric is available, with many of the designs contained therein being similar to Design Number C30020, the design on the allegedly infringing garment, and to other patterns contained within *The Album*. However, the similarity among many of these designs also serves to illustrate the relatively modest differences needed in a pattern to make it distinct.

design); see also *Cosmos Jewelry Ltd. v. Po Sun Hon Co.*, 470 F.Supp. 2d 1072, 1084 (C.D. Cal. 2007) (finding no copyright infringement because of a lack of substantial similarity where both plaintiff's and defendant's jewelry featured plumeria flowers).

C. Plaintiff's Vicarious and/or Contributory Copyright Infringement Claim Must Fail.

Plaintiff does not dispute that if it cannot maintain its direct copyright infringement claim against either of the Defendants that its vicarious and/or contributory copyright infringement claim against Defendants, which is based on the same alleged facts and the same purported acts of infringement, also fails. *Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd.*, 545 U.S. 913, 930 (2005) ("One infringes contributorily by intentionally inducing or encouraging direct infringement, and infringes vicariously by profiting from direct infringement while declining to exercise the right to stop or limit it."). In addition, contribution to copyright infringement must be intentional in order to establish liability. *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 508 F.3d 1146, 1170-71 (9th Cir. 2007). Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that Defendants intentionally induced either each other or a third party to infringe Plaintiff's copyright in Design Number C30020. Similarly, "[v]icarious infringement requires proof that 'the defendant exercises the requisite control over the direct infringer and that the defendant derives a direct financial benefit from the direct infringer,'" and Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that Defendants had such direct control over either each other or a third party. *Dream Games of Arizona, Inc. v. PC Onsite*, 561 F.3d 983, 995 (9th Cir. 2009) (citing *Perfect 10*, 508 F.3d at 729). Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants' Motion as to Plaintiff's Second Claim for Relief for Vicarious and/or Contributory Copyright Infringement.

IV. Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff's First and Second Claims for Relief, and Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Adjudication is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

EXHIBIT G

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**PRIORITY SEND
JS-6**

CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL

Case No. **CV 09-2449-JFW (FMOx)**

Date: December 1, 2010

Title: L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. -v- William Carter Co., et al.

PRESENT:

HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**S. Eagle
Courtroom Deputy**

**None Present
Court Reporter**

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:

None

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:

None

PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS):

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT MS. BUBBLES, INC.
ATTORNEY'S FEES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$217,556.50;
and**

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT AEROPOSTALE,
INC. ATTORNEY'S FEES IN THE AMOUNT OF
\$198,888.56**

I. Factual and Procedural History

On July 16, 2010, Defendants Ms. Bubbles, Inc. ("Ms. Bubbles") and Aeropostale, Inc. ("Aeropostale") (collectively, "Defendants") filed a Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Costs ("Motion"). On July 26, 2010, Plaintiff L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. ("Plaintiff") filed its Opposition. On August 2, 2010, Defendants filed a Reply. On August 10, 2010, the Court issued an order granting Defendants' Motion, and ordered the parties to meet and confer to resolve any disputes regarding the amount of reasonable attorney's fees that should be awarded to Defendants, and submit a joint statement to the Court if they could not resolve their disputes. The parties failed to reach an agreement during the meet and confer process, and on August 31, 2010, they filed their Joint Statement Re: Defendants' Attorneys' Fees ("Joint Report"). The Joint Report failed to include the description, or narrative, for each of the disputed entries, which was specifically required by the Court's August 10, 2010 Order granting Defendants attorneys' fees. On September 21, 2010, the Court ordered the parties to file an amended Joint Statement with a summary table in the format shown in Exhibit A to the September 21, 2010 Order. On October 12, 2010, after the Court granted an extension of time to file the amended Joint Report, the parties filed their Revised Joint Statement Re: Defendants' Attorneys' Fees ("Revised Joint Report").

II. Discussion

In this case, the parties were unable to reach any agreements during the meet and confer process, and, therefore, the Court must determine the amount of attorney's fees that should be awarded to Defendants. "The most useful starting point for determining the amount of a reasonable fee is the number of hours reasonably expended on the litigation multiplied by a reasonable hourly rate." *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983). This equation is commonly referred to as the "lodestar." See, *Welch v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 480 F.3d 942, 945 (9th Cir. 2007). The prevailing rate in the community is indicative of the reasonable hourly rate for purposes of calculating attorney's fees using the lodestar method. *Jordan v. Multnomah County*, 815 F.2d 1258, 1263 (9th Cir. 1987). The fee applicant has the burden of producing satisfactory evidence, in addition to the affidavits of its counsel, that the requested rates are in line with those prevailing in the community for similar services of lawyers of reasonably comparable skill and reputation. *Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 895, n.11 (1984). The fee applicant also "bears the burden of documenting the appropriate hours expended in the litigation and must submit evidence in support of those hours worked." *Gates v. Deukmejian*, 987 F.2d 1392, 1397 (9th Cir. 1992). "In determining the appropriate lodestar amount, the district court may exclude from the fee request any hours that are 'excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary.'" *Welch*, 480 F.3d at 946 (quoting *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 433). In making its reasonableness determination, the district court has considerable discretion to adjust the lodestar upward or downward on the basis of the twelve factors set forth in *Kerr v. Screen Guild Extras, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 67, 70 (9th Cir. 1975), *cert. denied*, 425 U.S. 951 (1976), some of which are subsumed into the initial lodestar calculation.¹ *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d 359, 364 (9th Cir. 1996). In addition, "[i]f opposing counsel cannot come up with specific reasons for reducing the fee request that the district court finds persuasive, it should normally grant the award in full, or with no more than a haircut." *Moreno v. City of Sacramento*, 534 F.3d 1106, 1116 (9th Cir. 2008).

A. The Hourly Rates Requested By Counsel for Defendants Are Reasonable.

Ms. Bubbles seeks fees for work performed by its attorneys, Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP ("LBBS"), and Lacey Dunn & Do ("LDD"). Aeropostale seeks fees for work performed by its attorneys, Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP ("KMR"). Plaintiff does not dispute the reasonableness of the hourly rates charged by the attorneys representing Ms. Bubbles at LBBS or LDD.² However, Plaintiff does dispute the reasonableness of the hourly rates charged by the

¹These "subsumed factors" include (1) the novelty and complexity of the issues; (2) the special skill and experience of counsel; (3) the quality of representation; (4) *the results obtained*; and (5) the contingent nature of the fee agreement. *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d 359, 364 n.9 (9th Cir. 1996). In the Ninth Circuit, the favored approach is to adjust the lodestar on the basis of the subsumed reasonableness factors *before* calculating the lodestar. *Id.*

² Even though Plaintiff does not dispute the reasonableness of the hourly rates charged by LBBS or LDD, the Court has independently considered those hourly rates and the experience of each attorney and finds that the hourly rates charged by LBBS and LDD are reasonable. Those billing rates are as follows: (1) Deborah F. Sirias billed at \$225.00 per hour; (2) Thomas S. Kidde billed at \$225.00 per hour; (3) Robert M. Collins billed at \$195.00 per hour; and (4) Daniel F. Lewis

attorneys at KMR representing Aeropostale.

The hourly rates for the attorneys at KMR that billed time to this action are as follows³: (1) Karen Artz Ash, whose billing rate was \$715.50 per hour in 2009 and \$738 per hour in 2010; (2) Jay Shapiro, whose billing rate was \$544.50 per hour in 2009 and \$562.50 in 2010; (3) Zia F. Modabber, whose billing rate was \$544.50 per hour in 2009 and \$562.50 per hour in 2010; (4) Bret J. Danow, whose billing rate was \$495 per hour in 2009⁴; (5) Keely L. Herrick, whose billing rate was \$477 per hour in 2009⁵; (6) Cory Baskin, whose billing rate was \$346.50 per hour in 2009 and \$396 per hour in 2010; and (7) Kristin L. Holland, whose billing rate was \$450 per hour in 2009 and \$463.50 per hour in 2010.⁶ In addition the hourly rates for the paralegals at KMR that billed time to this action are as follows: (1) Vasiliki Plevritis, whose billing rate was \$198 per hour in 2009 and \$202.50 in 2010; and (2) Georgia Saltsman, whose billing rate is \$229.50 in 2010.⁷

In her declaration, Ms. Holland details the experience and reputation of each attorney, which supports the hourly rates charged by those attorneys. Ms. Ash, who is a partner at KMR and the national co-chair of its Intellectual Property Practice Group, has been practicing in the intellectual property field for approximately 30 years. Ms. Ash has authored over 50 articles, including articles published in *The Patent and Trademark Copyright Journal* and *Managing Intellectual Property*, and was selected by Forbes.com as a "Best Lawyer in America" (IP) in 2005. Mr. Shapiro, who is a partner at KMR and a member of its Insurance and Risk Management, Litigation and Dispute Resolution and White Collar Criminal and Civil Litigation and Compliance Practice Groups, has been an attorney for approximately 30 years, and has tried over 35 cases in state and federal court, including intellectual property disputes. In fact, Mr. Shapiro has represented Aeropostale in numerous trademark and copyright matters. Mr. Shapiro has written and co-authored numerous publications, including *Moore's Federal Practice*, 3d Ed., Summary Judgment (Matthew Bender), and has been an Adjunct Professor of Law at New York Law School since 1989. Mr. Modabber, who is a partner at KMR and Chair of its Los Angeles Litigation and Dispute Resolution Practice, has been an attorney for approximately 22 years. Mr. Modabber is an experienced trial lawyer, and has been recognized nationally as one of the best lawyers in the country. Mr. Danow, who is a partner at KMR and a member of its Intellectual Property Practice, has been an attorney for approximately 20 years. Ms. Herrick, who is an associate at KMR, has been an attorney for

billed at \$195.00 per hour.

³ These rates and the rates for the paralegals billed to this matter include the ten percent discount that KMR normally provides to Aeropostale.

⁴ Mr. Danow did not bill any time to this matter in 2010.

⁵ Ms. Herrick did not bill any time to this matter in 2010.

⁶ While Plaintiff complains about the number of attorneys at KMR that worked on this case, three of those attorneys, Mr. Modabber, Ms. Herrick, and Mr. Danow, billed less than 10 hours, and those hours were billed during the early stage of the case and before the matter was transferred to the team assembled to defend this action.

⁷ Ms. Saltsman did not bill any time to this matter in 2009.

approximately eight years, and her practice focuses on intellectual property law. Mr. Baskin, who is an associate at KMR and a member of its Litigation and Dispute Resolution Department, has been an attorney for approximately 5 years and his practice focuses on all aspects of business litigation. Ms. Holland, who is a partner at KMR and a member of its Intellectual Property Litigation Department, has litigated intellectual property disputes for 14 years. Ms. Holland has spoken extensively on intellectual property issues, and serves as the Chair of the Outside Counsel Advisory Board of the Association of Media and Entertainment Counsel.

In addition to their extensive experience, the KMR attorney's hourly rates are reasonable when compared to the prevailing rates charged in Los Angeles "for similar services of lawyers with reasonably comparable skill, experience, and reputation." *Blum*, 465 U.S. at 895. For example, the American Intellectual Property Law Association ("AIPPLA") Survey, *Report of the Economic Survey 2007* and the National Law Journal's 2008 *Billing Survey*, reveal that the rates charged by KMR in this action are below the average rates charged by large national firms with offices in Los Angeles, such as Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton and Manatt, Phelps & Phillips.⁸ In addition, courts in this district have found that rates ranging from \$690 per hour for a senior partner to \$305 per hour for a junior associate in 2006 charged by Manatt, Phelps & Phillips in a copyright case were "consistent with the rates typically charged by other highly-regarded southern California law firms for similar work for attorneys of comparable experience." *Love v. Mail on Sunday*, 2007 WL 2709975, *8 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 7, 2007).

Based on a comparison of the expertise, experience, and reputation of the KMR attorneys in intellectual property law with the hourly rates charged by comparable law firms, the Court finds that the rates charged by the KMR attorneys are reasonable. Accordingly, the Court finds that Aeropostale has produced satisfactory evidence that the rates requested by its counsel are in-line with prevailing rates in the community. See *United Steelworkers of America v. Phelps Dodge Corp.*, 896 F.2d 403, 407 (9th Cir. 1990) (holding that "[a]ffidavits of the plaintiffs' attorney and other attorneys regarding prevailing fees in the community and rate determinations in other cases, particularly setting a rate for the plaintiffs' attorney, are satisfactory evidence of the prevailing market rate").

While Plaintiff offers no evidence that the KMR attorneys' hourly rates are unreasonable, it nonetheless argues that the hourly rates requested by Aeropostale are grossly inflated and excessive. However, Plaintiff's naked assertion that Aeropostale has not met its burden of demonstrating the reasonableness of the KMR attorneys' hourly rates is insufficient to rebut the evidence submitted by Aeropostale.⁹ See, *United Steelworkers*, 896 F.2d at 407 (holding that the district court must assume that the rates established by the plaintiffs' evidence are reasonable where "[a]lthough the defendants disagreed with this evidence, they did not support their

⁸ The 2011 Vault 100 "Prestige Rankings," voted on by more than 15,000 attorneys nationwide, and the 2010 AmLaw 100 rankings of the top law firms in the country by gross revenue and revenue per lawyer demonstrate that these firms are comparable to KMR in expertise, experience, and reputation.

⁹ Similarly, Plaintiff fails to present any evidence to support its conclusory assertion that the rates charged by the attorneys that work in KMR's New York office are "significantly higher" than in Los Angeles.

arguments with any affidavits or evidence of their own regarding the legal rates in the community").

B. The Majority of Hours Billed by Defendants' Counsel Are Reasonable.

1. The Majority of Hours Billed by Counsel for Ms. Bubbles Are Reasonable.

Ms. Bubbles requests an award of \$218,366.50, which consists of \$2,740.00 in fees billed by LDD, its former counsel, and \$215,626.50 in fees billed by LBBS, its current counsel. In addition to the issues raised by Plaintiff in the Revised Joint Report, the Court has conducted its own independent review of the billing statements submitted by counsel for Ms. Bubbles and determined, with certain exceptions discussed herein, that the majority of hours billed are reasonable.

a. Ms. Bubbles Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees for the Hours Spent Preparing Documents Plaintiff Contends Were Prepared in L.A. *Printex Industries, Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.*, CV 08-7085-DDP (Ex).

Plaintiff argues that Ms. Bubbles is not entitled to an award of attorney's fees for hours spent preparing documents, including pleadings, motions, and discovery requests and responses, that Plaintiff contends are virtually identical to those prepared by Ms. Bubbles in an earlier action, *L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.*, CV 08-7085-DDP (Ex) (the "*Aeropostale* action"). Plaintiff argues that both actions were simple copyright infringement actions, and, thus, the fees charged by counsel for Ms. Bubbles related to the preparation of these documents should be reduced by at least 75 percent.

Ms. Bubbles argues that a simple comparison of the questioned documents, including Ms. Bubbles' Answer, initial disclosures, requests for documents, interrogatories, and responses to requests for production of documents, reveal multiple substantive differences in the documents, which clearly demonstrate that the documents prepared in this case are the product of original work. In addition, Ms. Bubbles argues that the presence of different issues in each case necessitated the preparation of documents tailored to the issues in that case. For example, the issues in the *Aeropostale* action involved whether Plaintiff was allowed to copyright works that were allegedly derivative of artwork found on Adobe Photoshop and the validity of Plaintiff's purported published collective work copyright registration. In contrast, the issues in this action related to whether Plaintiff had ever submitted the textile design at issue to the Copyright Office and the validity of Plaintiff's allegedly unpublished collection.

The Court agrees with Ms. Bubbles. As the Ninth Circuit recently stated in *Moreno v. City of Sacramento*, 534 F.3d 1106, 1112 (2008):

The court may reduce the number of hours awarded because the lawyer performed unnecessarily duplicative work, but determining whether work is unnecessarily duplicative is no easy task. When a case goes on for many years, a lot of legal work product will grow stale; a competent lawyer won't rely entirely on last year's, or even last month's research; Cases are decided; statutes are enacted; regulations are promulgated and amended. A lawyer also needs to get up to speed with the

research previously performed. All of this is duplication, of course, but it's *necessary* duplication; it is inherent in the process of litigating over time. . . . One certainly expects *some* degree of duplication as an inherent part of the process. There is no reason why the lawyer should perform this necessary work for free.

In this case, the documents Plaintiff claims were duplicative were prepared in an entirely different case that involved different copyright infringement issues. It would be highly irresponsible and border on malpractice for counsel to simply cut-and-paste pleadings, motions, and discovery requests and responses from another copyright infringement case without regard to the unique issues in this case. The frivolous nature of Plaintiff's objection is demonstrated by the fact that Plaintiff's counsel billed substantial time for identical or nearly identical work in this case and in a separate copyright infringement action. Accordingly, Ms. Bubbles is entitled to a full award of attorney's fees for hours spent preparing documents that Plaintiff argues are duplicative of those drafted in the *Aeropostale* action.

b. Ms. Bubbles Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees for the Hours Spent Reviewing Documents Produced By or To Its Co-Defendants.

Plaintiff claims that the 23.8 hours billed by LBBS to review documents produced by or to its co-defendants in this case should be reduced by at least 75 percent because the documents were unrelated to the claims alleged against Ms. Bubbles, and, therefore, such an exhaustive review was unnecessary.

Ms. Bubbles claims that Plaintiff's argument is "ridiculous" and essentially suggests that LBBS should have represented its client "with blinders on, ignoring documents filed and served by its co-defendants." Revised Joint Report, 43:27-44:1.

The Court agrees with Ms. Bubbles. The 23.8 hours billed to review documents related to its co-defendants is minuscule when considered in relation to the overall amount billed by counsel for Ms. Bubbles, and, in absence of any evidence to the contrary, is reasonable. As Ms. Bubbles correctly points out, "Plaintiff cannot on the one hand enjoy significant convenience and costs savings by suing multiple defendants in a single action and then blame [Ms. Bubbles] for monitoring the case against the several co-defendants." *Id.*, at 44:10-12. LBBS had a duty to review all of the documents that related to its co-defendants to determine whether or not those documents impacted Ms. Bubbles' defense, involved a motion Ms. Bubbles wished to join, or required objections or additional briefing to clarify Ms. Bubbles' position in light of those documents. Accordingly, Ms. Bubbles is entitled to a full award of attorney's fees for hours spent reviewing documents produced by or to its co-defendants.

c. Ms. Bubbles Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees for the Hours Spent Preparing for Depositions.

Plaintiff argues that the 60.3 hours billed by LBBS to prepare for the depositions of Ms. Moon Choi and Mr. Jae Nah is "egregiously" excessive and should be reduced by at least 80 percent. Plaintiff contends that because there were several entries in the billing records related to the depositions of Cindy Song and Daniel Jung in the *Aeropostale* action, it is extremely likely that a substantial portion of the time spent preparing for Mr. Nah's deposition in the *Aeropostale*

action¹⁰ was billed to this action. Plaintiff further contends that because two of the three deponents produced by Aeropostale in this action were also produced in the *Aeropostale* action, the time billed for preparing to depose those witnesses in this action was somehow duplicative of work done in the *Aeropostale* action.

First, Ms. Bubbles denies that LBBS billed time for work performed in the *Aeropostale* action to this action. Ms. Bubbles concedes that an April 16, 2010 entry for 1.2 hours related to preparing for the deposition of Cindy Song was erroneously billed to this action instead of the *Aeropostale* action, and has deducted \$270.00 from its fee request.¹¹

In addition, Ms. Bubbles notes that it was required to prepare for the depositions of Mr. Nah and Ms. Choi on multiple occasions because Plaintiff repeatedly refused at the last minute to produce these deponents, necessitating re-noticing and preparing for these depositions on multiple occasions. For example, the deposition of Plaintiff's Rule 30(b)(6) deponent, Mr. Nah, was originally scheduled for November 10, 2009, and rescheduled to accommodate other defendants for March 4, 2010. On March 2, 2010, Plaintiff unilaterally cancelled the deposition, which was rescheduled for April 7, 2010. On April 5, 2010, Plaintiff again unilaterally cancelled the deposition, which was then rescheduled for April 30, 2010. On April 29, 2010, Plaintiff again cancelled the deposition. The defendants were finally able to depose Mr. Nah on May 20, 2010, a mere four days before the cut-off for filing a motion for summary judgment. Ms. Bubbles also correctly points out that time spent preparing its witnesses who were also deposed in the *Aeropostale* action was not duplicative, and failure to separately prepared its witnesses for deposition in this action "in a factually distinguishable lawsuit, would be the height of client disservice if not outright malpractice." Revised Joint Report, 64:11-12.

The Court agrees with Ms. Bubbles. Once again, Plaintiff argues without evidentiary support that merely because similar work was performed in two separate copyright infringement actions involving some of the same parties, Ms. Bubbles should not be entitled to recover its fees for performing that work in this action.¹² However, Plaintiff again fails to acknowledge that any duplication of efforts in these two cases was necessary because of the different facts and legal theories presented in the two cases. In addition, Plaintiff cannot reasonably expect to repeatedly cancel the deposition of Mr. Nah at the last minute on three separate occasions and now benefit from that questionable behavior by arguing that the work entailed in preparing for the cancelled depositions was excessive. Accordingly, Ms. Bubbles is entitled to an award of attorney's fees for

¹⁰ Mr. Nah was deposed in both cases.

¹¹ Ms. Bubbles also argues that the only billing entry in this case relating to Daniel Jung, who was deposed in the *Aeropostale* action, consists of an entry for .2 of an hour and that time was necessary because counsel was considering the necessity of deposing Mr. Jung in this action at that time, and, thus, that entry is not erroneous.

¹² The arbitrary nature of Plaintiff's proposed reductions are evident throughout its Opposition. For example, without any evidentiary support or explanation as to why the reduction in fees should be different, Plaintiff argues that the fees requested by LBBS related to deposition preparation should be reduced by 80 percent while the fees requested by KMR for the same work should be reduced by only 75.

hours spent preparing for depositions.

d. Ms. Bubbles Is Not Entitled to Its Attorney's Fees for Hours Related to the Proposed Protective Order.

Plaintiff argues that Ms. Bubbles should not be reimbursed for the 3.6 hours billed for preparing and discussing with counsel a proposed protective order because Magistrate Judge Fernando M. Olguin rejected the proposed protective order because it failed to comply with California state law and the Local Rules. Ms. Bubbles argues that the modest amount of time devoted to this task was reasonable, even if the proposed protective order was rejected by the Court.

The Court agrees with Plaintiff. In *Cabrales v. County of Los Angeles*, the Ninth Circuit held that a party "who is unsuccessful at a stage of litigation that was a necessary step to her ultimate victory is entitled to attorney's fees even for the unsuccessful stage." 935 F.2d 1050, 1053 (9th Cir. 1991) (holding that party was entitled to attorney's fees related to unsuccessful writ petition where the prevailing party had unsuccessfully opposed a request for certiorari to the United States Supreme Court, but ultimately prevailed on remand). However, as the Court in *Signature Networks, Inc. v. Estefan*, held:

Cabrales, however, does not hold that an "improper" step can be considered a "necessary step" to victory. Indeed, such an extension of *Cabrales* would be illogical – allowing recovery of attorneys' fees for improper actions taken by a prevailing party would reward improperly multiplying the proceedings.

2005 WL 1249522, *5 (N.D. Cal. May 25, 2005) (upholding magistrate's refusal to award attorney's fees for improperly filed Florida action). In this case, the proposed protective order was rejected by Magistrate Judge Olguin, in part, because it failed to conform to the Local Rules. To allow Ms. Bubbles to recover fees when its counsel failed to follow the Local Rules would be rewarding counsel's failure to follow the Court's Local Rules. Accordingly, the Court will not award the \$810.00 in attorney's fees sought by Ms. Bubbles for hours related to the proposed protective order.

e. Ms. Bubbles Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees for Hours Related to Preparing an *Ex Parte* Application to Continue the Hearing Cut-Off Date.

Plaintiff argues that Ms. Bubbles should not be reimbursed for time spent preparing an *ex parte* application to continue the motion cut-off date because such an application was never filed in this action but was instead filed in the *Aeropostale* action.

Ms. Bubbles argues that the preparation of an *ex parte* application was required because of Plaintiff's persistent refusal to produce its witnesses for deposition, including producing Mr. Nah for the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition a mere four days before the motion cut-off date. The *ex parte* application was never filed because after the deposition was completed LBBS made the wise strategic decision to simply expedite the transcripts of Ms. Choi and Mr. Nah rather than burden the Court with the *ex parte* application.

The Court agrees with Ms. Bubbles. As discussed above, Plaintiff should not be rewarded for its repeated unjustified last-minute cancellations of the properly-noticed depositions in this action. Ms. Bubbles should not be penalized for LBBS's decision to forego the *ex parte* application seeking an extension of the motion hearing deadline in favor of simply expediting the work necessary to timely file its motion for summary judgment. Ms. Bubbles is entitled to all attorney's fees reasonably expended in defending the claims against it, even if some of those fees were spent on ultimately untaken or unsuccessful steps. See, e.g., *Cabrales*, 935 F.2d at 1053. Accordingly, Ms. Bubbles is entitled to its fees for preparing the *ex parte* application to continue the hearing cut-off date.

f. Ms. Bubbles Is Not Entitled to Attorney's Fees for the Hours Related to a Motion for Reconsideration.

Ms. Bubbles concedes that a May 26, 2010 entry for 1.5 hours related to researching the possibility of obtaining a stay on a motion for reconsideration was erroneously billed to this action, and, instead, should have been billed to the *Aeropostale* action. Ms. Bubbles' fee request of \$218,366.50 includes a deduction of \$292.50 for this erroneous time entry.

g. Ms. Bubbles Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees for the Hours Related to the Mediation.

Plaintiff argues that the 21.1 hours billed for the mediation should be reduced by at least 50 percent because less than half that time was devoted to drafting and revising the mediation brief, and the rest of the time was spent on scheduling the mediation and discussing mediation strategy with counsel for the other defendants.

Ms. Bubbles argues and the Court agrees that it was reasonable to spend 21.1 hours over the course of several months to prepare a mediation brief, coordinate scheduling issues with the mediator, coordinate with counsel for the other defendants, and to prepare the client and insurance carrier representative to participate in a mediation in a case with a potential exposure in excess of \$800,000.

Having reviewed the billing records, the majority of the conferences among counsel for Ms. Bubbles and its client, counsel for the other defendants, and/or the mediator were billed in reasonable increments of .1, .2, or .3 of an hour, and there is no evidence that there was an excessive number of such conferences. As Ms. Bubbles points out, the number of conferences to coordinate a mutually-agreeable mediation date and other scheduling issues was necessitated in part by Plaintiff's decision to name so many defendants in one action. Moreover, Plaintiff objects to some time entries for conferences, but not others, without giving any legal or factual basis for these objections. Accordingly, Ms. Bubbles is entitled to an award of fees for the hours claimed for the mediation.

h. Ms. Bubbles Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees for the Hours Related to the Motion for Attorney's Fees.

Plaintiff argues that the 45.3 hours spent by Ms. Bubbles on its motion for attorney's fees is "clearly excessive" and should be reduced by at least 75 percent.

Ms. Bubbles argues that the time spent on the motion for attorney's fees was reasonable because Ms. Bubbles was required to collect and review invoices and other records for an entire year, draft multiple declarations in support of its request, and research and draft the motion and reply. Ms. Bubbles concedes that \$42.00 in fees billed (for .1 of an hour billed by Ms. Sirias and .1 of an hour billed by Mr. Collins) related to work done on the pending appeal of this case should not have been included in its fee request and, thus, have been deducted from its request for \$218,366.50 in attorney's fees.

The Court agrees with Ms. Bubbles. In this case, while there were no novel or unique legal or factual issues related to the attorney's fees motion, it involved substantial review and analysis of billing and other records for multiple attorneys for a one year time period, and required substantial coordination between Ms. Bubbles and Aeropostale in the preparation of the attorney's fees motion, reply, and related declarations. All of these tasks were time-consuming, and the Court's review of the billing records fails to demonstrate that the time spent by counsel was "clearly excessive" or unreasonable given the tasks involved. Accordingly, Ms. Bubbles is entitled to a full award of fees for the hours related to the motion for attorney's fees.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Court finds that \$217,556.50 of the 218,366.50 in attorney's fees requested by Ms. Bubbles are reasonable.¹³ Accordingly, Ms. Bubbles is entitled to an award of attorney's fees of \$217,556.50.

2. The Majority of Hours Billed by Counsel for Aeropostale Are Reasonable.

Aeropostale requests an award of \$250,027.75 for services rendered by its counsel, KMR. In addition to the issues raised by Plaintiff in the Revised Joint Report, the Court has conducted an independent review of the billing statements submitted by Aeropostale's counsel and determined that, with some exceptions, the majority of hours billed are reasonable.

a. Aeropostale Is Not Entitled to Attorney's Fees for Hours Related to the Proposed Protective Order But Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees for Hours Related to Preparing Other Documents Plaintiff Contends Were Prepared in *L.A. Printex Industries, Inc. v. Aeropostale, Inc.*, CV 08-7085-DDP (Ex).

Plaintiff argues that Aeropostale is not entitled to an award of fees for hours spent preparing documents, including pleadings, motions, and discovery requests and responses, that Plaintiff contends were virtually identical to those prepared and filed in the *Aeropostale* action. Plaintiff argues that both actions were simple copyright infringement actions, and, thus, the fees charged by KMR related to the preparing of these documents should be significantly reduced. With respect

¹³ The attorney's fees request of Ms. Bubbles has been reduced by \$810.00 for the reasons discussed.

to Plaintiff's request to reduce the fees incurred in preparing Aeropostale's Answer, preparing the indemnity agreement between Aeropostale and Ms. Bubbles, and preparing discovery requests and responses¹⁴, the Court finds that those hours were not duplicative of time billed in the *Aeropostale* action, and Aeropostale is entitled to an award of attorney's fees for hours spent preparing those documents. See, e.g., *Moreno v. City of Sacramento*, 534 F.3d 1106, 1112 (2008).

However, with respect to attorney's fees for hours spent drafting the proposed protective order, the Court agrees with Plaintiff that Aeropostale should not be allowed to recover those fees. As explained above in denying Ms. Bubbles' request for fees, awarding Aeropostale attorney's fees for a proposed protective order that failed to comply with the Local Rules would be tantamount to rewarding counsel's failure to follow the Court's Local Rules. Accordingly, the attorney's fees awarded to Aeropostale will be reduced by \$1,417.05 (This reduction consists of \$544.50 billed by Mr. Moddaber, and \$872.55 billed by Mr. Baskin).

b. Aeropostale Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees Related to Deposition Preparation.

Plaintiff argues that the 41.1 hours billed for deposition preparation by KMR are "disingenuous" and should be reduced by at least 75 percent. As explained above, Plaintiff cannot cancel the deposition of Mr. Nah at the last minute on three separate occasions and now expect to be rewarded for its conduct by accusing KMR of over-billing for the obvious work entailed in preparing for the cancelled depositions. Similarly, it is disingenuous for Plaintiff to argue that it is "perplexing" that Mr. Baskin billed time to researching, reviewing, and scheduling deposition when he did not attend any of the deposition. As Plaintiff is well aware, it is common for the partner who plans on taking a deposition to delegate these sorts of tasks to a trusted associate with a significantly lower billing rate in order to reduce the costs to its client. Accordingly, the Court finds that Aeropostale is entitled to an award for all attorney's fees for hours related to deposition preparation.

c. Aeropostale Is Entitled to Its Attorney's Fees Related to Its Motion for a More Definite Statement.

Plaintiff argues that Aeropostale should not be awarded fees for any of the 32.4 hours billed to its motion for a more definite statement because it was denied by the Court.¹⁵

Aeropostale argues that, even though the motion for a more definite statement was denied, it allowed Aeropostale to identify key issues in the case, including what eventually became one of the primary grounds for the Court's granting of summary judgment in Aeropostale's favor, and,

¹⁴ Although Plaintiff has made "Fees Related to Discovery" a separate heading in the Revised Joint Report, Plaintiff's main argument against awarding Aeropostale these fees is that they are duplicative of fees billed in the *Aeropostale* action.

¹⁵ Some of the time entries refer to this motion as a motion to dismiss, but, according to KMR, all these entries describe the same motion.

thus, these fees are recoverable.

The Court agrees with Aeropostale. The Court finds that Aeropostale is entitled to all attorney's fees reasonably expended in defending the claims against it, even if a portion of those fees was incurred in pursuing ultimately unsuccessful steps. See, e.g., *Cabralles*, 935 F.2d at 1053 (holding that it "makes little sense" to "scalpel out attorney's fees for every setback, no matter how temporary, regardless of its relationship to the ultimate disposition of the case."). Accordingly, Aeropostale is entitled to an award for all attorney's fees related to its motion for a more definite statement.

d. Aeropostale Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees for the Hours Related to the Mediation.

Plaintiff argues that the 19.0 hours billed by Aeropostale for mediation preparation is excessive and should be reduced by 75 percent because LBBS drafted and submitted the mediation brief on behalf of both Defendants.

Aeropostale argues that while LBBS took the laboring oar with respect to preparing the mediation brief, KMR provided extensive input and revisions before the mediation brief was finalized and submitted to the mediator. In addition, Aeropostale points out that the 19.0 hours billed was not exclusively related to preparing the mediation brief, but also included time spent preparing for and participating in the mediation, including gathering and reviewing key documents in support of its settlement position and outlining key points that it determined were important to make at the mediation.

In this case, the Court agrees with Aeropostale. Having reviewed the billings records, the Court finds that the time spent related to all aspects of mediation preparation – scheduling the mediation, conferring with co-defense counsel, reviewing and revising the mediation brief, and preparing client and counsel for the mediation – are entirely reasonable given the size and scope of this case. Accordingly, Aeropostale is entitled to an award for all attorney's fees related to the mediation.

e. Aeropostale Has Waived Its Request for Fees for Hours Billed by Vasiliki Plevritis.

Aeropostale "[i]n the spirit of cooperation and as a sign of good faith" agreed to deduct from its attorney's fee request the \$3,111.21 billed by Ms. Plevritis, and its fee request of \$250,027.75 includes this deduction.¹⁶

f. Aeropostale Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees Related to Its Motion for Attorney's Fees.

¹⁶ On page 6 of the Revised Joint Report, Aeropostale states that it removed \$3,456.90 in paralegal fees from its fee request, and on page 150 of the Revised Joint Report, it states that it removed \$3,111.21 from its fee request. Regardless of the exact amount, the fees for hours billed by Ms. Plevritis have been removed from the \$250,027.75 in fees requested by Aeropostale.

Plaintiff argues that the 31.8 hours billed by KMR in connection with its motion for attorney's fees is unreasonable and should be drastically reduced or disallowed entirely because Defendants submitted a joint motion for attorney's fees for which LBBS billed 45.3 hours. Plaintiff also argues that some of the work, such as organizing the billing records, is clerical in nature and should not be compensated.

Aeropostale argues that, in addition to the drafting of the motion and reply briefs, KMR was also required to draft extensive declarations in support of the request for attorney's fees and to carefully review the billing and other records for completeness and accuracy.

In this case, the Court agrees with Aeropostale. For the same reasons discussed in connection with Ms. Bubbles' fee request, while there were no novel or unique legal or factual issues related to the attorney's fees motion, it involved substantial review and analysis of billing and other records for multiple attorneys for a one year time period, and substantial coordination between Ms. Bubbles and Aeropostale in the preparation of the attorney's fees motion, reply, and related declarations. All of these tasks were time-consuming, and the Court's review of the billing records fails to demonstrate that the time spent by counsel was "clearly excessive" or unreasonable given the tasks involved. Accordingly, Aeropostale is entitled to a full award of fees for the hours related to the motion for attorney's fees.

g. Aeropostale Is Entitled to Attorney's Fees In This Action For the Review of Pleadings and Papers from the *Aeropostale* Action.

Plaintiff argues that fees incurred by KMR in reviewing pleadings or other papers from the *Aeropostale* action are not properly billed to this case.

Aeropostale argues that, with the exception of .3 of an hour billed by Mr. Baskin on May 19, 2010, it has confirmed that all of the entries questioned by Plaintiff were properly billed in this case because pleadings and other papers from the *Aeropostale* action were relevant to issues in this case, and, therefore, were properly reviewed by KMR attorneys.

In this case, the Court agrees with Aeropostale. The Court concludes that there is no evidence that it was unreasonable for counsel to review the pleadings and papers filed in a similar copyright infringement case involving many of the same parties in order to develop a strategy to properly defend against the claims in this case. Such a review also permitted KMR to avoid duplicating work that had been previously performed in the *Aeropostale* action. Accordingly, Aeropostale is entitled to a full award of fees for the review of pleadings and papers from the *Aeropostale* action.¹⁷

h. The Award of Attorney's Fees Should be Reduced Because KMR Engaged in Block Billing.

¹⁷ Aeropostale's fee request of \$250,027.75 includes a deduction of \$118.00 for the erroneous May 19, 2010 time entry.

Plaintiff argues that all of the fees billed by KMR are questionable because of the “extensive use of block billing,”¹⁸ and, thus, the fees should be reduced by at least 75 percent. In fact, in every category of fees disputed by Plaintiff, block billing is one of the major issues raised by the Plaintiff. Aeropostale disputes that KMR engages in an “extensive practice” of block billing, and points out that many of the entries that are allegedly block-billed are actually a collection of “related tasks.”

Having reviewed KMR’s bills, the Court agrees that many of the time entries include multiple tasks in a single billing entry. For example, most of the initial billing entries are block billed: (1) on April 8, 2009, Kristin Holland billed .4 of an hour to “[r]eview new filing by LA Printex and draft email to team regarding same; follow up regarding indemnity issues with Ms. Bubbles counsel;” (2) on April 8, 2009, Zia Modabber billed .5 of an hour to “[r]eview complaint; factual investigation and strategy re indemnity;” (3) on April 9, 2009, Zia Modabber billed .8 of an hour to “[r]eview emails; quick review of draft complaint; review draft Rule 6 letter;” and (4) on April 9, 2009, Karen Ash billed 1.8 hours to “[r]eview new Complaint filed by LA Printex for review and evaluation with client and LA counsel and in context of Ms. Bubbles obligations and indemnities. Several evaluations of exhibits suggestion for review with counsel for Ms. Bubbles and review status of other LA Printex [cases].” KMR’s practice of block-billing is present in all of the bills reviewed by the Court.

KMR’s “block-billing” makes it impossible for the Court to determine how much time was spent on each discrete task and prevents the Court from making an informed decision as to which specific entries are excessive, duplicative, or simply erroneous. The Court’s review of the time records submitted by KMR reveals that a significant portion of the entries have been improperly block-billed. In fact, the only entries that do not appear to be block-billed are for days on which only one task was performed.

“It is reasonable for a district court to conclude that a fee applicant submitting block-billed time entries has failed to carry his burden to submit evidence which properly documents the hours expended on the litigation because block billing makes it more difficult to determine how much time was spent on particular activities.” *Id.* at 948. Therefore, because of KMR’s practice of block-billing and the arguments made by Plaintiff as to the excessive and duplicative nature of several specific entries, the Court concludes that KMR’s block-billing has resulted in over-billing by approximately 20 percent. See, The State Bar of California Committee on Mandatory Fee Arbitration, Arbitration Advisory 03-01 (2003) (concluding that block billing “may increase time by 10% to 30%”); *Bonner v. Fuji Photo Film*, 2008 WL 410260, at *3-4 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2008) (“Because so much of [counsel’s] work cannot be accurately audited, the Court is concerned that her bill may be inflated by as much as 30%. Accordingly, the Court will impose an across-the-board reduction of 30% to [counsel’s] bill . . .”).

Accordingly, the Court applies an across-the-board reduction of 20 percent to the time billed

¹⁸ “‘Block billing’ is the ‘the time-keeping method by which each lawyer and legal assistant enters the total daily time spent working on a case, rather than itemizing the time expended on specific tasks.’” *Welch*, 480 F.3d at 945 n.2 (quoting *Harolds Stores, Inc. v. Dillard Dep’t Stores, Inc.*, 82 F.3d 1533, 1554 n.15 (10th Cir. 1996)).

by KMR.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Court finds that \$198,888.56 of the \$250,027.75 in attorney's fees requested by Aeropostale are reasonable.¹⁹ Accordingly, Aeropostale is entitled to an award of attorney's fees of \$198,888.56.

III. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that Ms. Bubbles is entitled to recover attorney's fees in the amount of \$217,556.50. The Court also finds that Aeropostale is entitled to recover attorney's fees in the amount of \$198,888.56.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

¹⁹ Aeropostale's attorney's fees request has been reduced by \$1,417.05, for the reasons discussed. The resulting \$248,610.70 has been further reduced by 20 percent, resulting in a total award of \$198,888.56.